श्री ईश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञा.

प्रथममाह्निकम् ॥ →

The Book presents the theory of Recognition in the form of Syllogism, including five terms : (i) proposition

(ii) Reason.

(iii) Examples.

(iv) Application — पांचं अवयव.

(v) Conclusion

निराशंसात्पूर्णादहमिति पुरा भासयति यद्-
द्विशाखामाशास्ते तदनु च विभङ्क्तुं निजकलाम् ।
स्वरूपादुन्मेषप्रसरणनिमेषस्थितिजुषस्-
तदद्वैतं वन्दे परमशिवशक्त्यात्म निखिलम् ॥१॥

निराशंसात् → पूर्णत्वेन विश्वनिर्भरतया च निराकाङ्क्षोऽपि अहन्तेदन्ता प्रतिभासविरहेऽपि । (अत्र तु निराशंसातस्य स्थाने निराभासात् इति तु पाठः ॥)

निराभासात् → अकुलात् → शिवशक्त्यादि रूपेभ्यः आभासेभ्यो निष्क्रान्तात्, एकत्वेन शिव-शक्त्यादि विकल्परहितादि इति यावत् ॥

पूर्णाद् → चित् स्वभावात् → तृप्तिं गतात् – अन्य कांक्षा रहित एव तृप्त उच्यते, तत च षटत्रिंशे शिव तत्त्वेप्यस्तीत्य उक्तं ।

निखिलम → सर्वाङ्गव्यापि – भाविनः समस्तस्य जडाजडस्य ~~निष्क्रान्तात्~~ अर्थजातस्यैतन्मयत्वं कथितम् ॥

अहमिति → स्वान्तर्गतं अहं विमर्श युक्तं शक्तिभागं – एतेन शिवशक्त्याख्य तत्त्वद्वयस्य प्रादुर्भावः ।

अहं वन्दे — अहमिति → परिमितवाचकाहं पद विषयम् अभिनव इति नामकं ,
वन्दे → सर्वोत्कर्ष परामर्श विषयताम् नयामि- प्रह्वीभावो नमस्कारार्थः ॥

परमशिव शक्त्यात्म →

स्वरूपाद् → अनुत्तरकुलरूपाद् वपुषः

पुरा → अग्रे → परामर्शतया अग्रे — निराकाङ्क्षोऽपि स्वातन्त्र्य माहात्म्यात् बहिरुल्लिलसिषया परानन्द चमत्कार तारतम्येन पुरा → प्रथमम अहमिति - परामर्शतया शक्तिदशां अधिशयानः प्रस्फुरेत प्रस्फुरति इति संभाव्यते ।

भासयति → अहं विमर्श युक्तं शक्ति भागं भासयति → स्वयं भासनशीलाकुलाख्य प्रकाशरूप शिवाऽभिचारेण स्वयं भासमाने सत समर्थीकरणेन प्रेरयति, केवलाया शक्तेर- तत्येगात् । न हि चक्षुर्ग्राह्यअग्नि स्वरूपं विना तत् शक्तिं दाहे समर्थी दृष्टा ॥

निजकलां → स्वस्वातन्त्र्य शक्तिं अहंरूपां — उद्भूतोद्भाविष्यमाणेन तत्त्व षट्त्रिंशकेना चक्रं समाने प्रोद्भूत शिव शक्ति विभागं स्वकीयं भागम् ।

विभुङ्क्तुम → सादाख्यादि भोण्यन्त तत्त्व चतुस्त्रिंशक भावेन विभाग विषयी कर्तुम –

आद्यास्ते → इच्छा शक्ति विषयतां नयति — अत्रैव इच्छाशक्ति उद्भूति अतः पूर्वं शिवशक्तिगतस्य चिदानन्दाख्यस्य शक्तिद्वयस्यैव संभवात् – ज्ञानक्रिया शक्त्योऽस्तु तत्त्व चतुस्त्रिंशक अन्तर्गतत्वेन अप्रशंसा विषयत्वात् ॥

(तथा) उन्मेषण → बहिरवलोकनेन, प्रसरणम् → अनारब्धेषु
भावेषु संचारः
निमेषेण → विसर्गकाले स्वात्मन्येव स्थानेन ।
स्थिति → आनन्द भरिते स्वरूपे विश्रान्मः
ते जुषत् इति तादृशात् ॥

Ahnika I

(1) I bow to that Absolute, which is unity of Parmshiva; the unity, which from its ultimate state, first of all manifests the pure Ego "I" & then through its will divides its powers into two; the ultimate state which, being without any manifestation, is Self-contained and is responsible for Creation and Dissolution through the play and suspension respectively of its power.

(2-4) Having been taught by Lakshmangupta I, Abhinavagupta, grand disciple of him, who wrote the flawless work, called Ishvarpratibhijnia, am writing this brief commentary on his (utpala's) work; the work which is representative of the System of Somananda, a gem in the family of Tryambka, and is a means to the attainment of the purely subjective Supreme human goal.

(5) Of this work, the author himself has given the substance in the Vritti and exposition in the Tika. I, therefore, in order to elucidate the concept of Recognition to people of slow understanding, but if to none, at least to myself.

P.T.O.

desiring to bring about in others the identification with the Highest Reality, the power of which he had himself realised within, & thinking that it could safely be brought about if he starts with referring to his own identification, the author, with a view to make others fit for the same, states the object. Here (in this verse) the statement of the object occupies a subordinate position to (the statement of) the realisation of identity with the highest aspect of the ultimate :—

(1) "Having somehow realised my identity with the Supreme

श्री त्रैयम्बक सद्वंश मध्यमुक्तामय स्थितेः ।
श्री सोमानन्दनाथस्य विज्ञान प्रतिबिम्बकम् ॥२॥

श्री सोमानन्दनाथस्य = सोमानन्द की श्री त्रैयम्बक (जो) = त्रैयम्बक नामक सद्वंश = सत् कुल, उच्च कुल मध्य = (के) बीच मुक्तामय → (वह कुल कैसा था) → मोती रूप, मोती के कांति चमकने वाला (कुल) एसा प्रज्वलित कुल (उसी कुल में) → स्थितेः = ~~स्थित~~ स्थित जो → सोमानन्द था, विज्ञान → उसी (सोमानन्द के विज्ञान की (शिवदृष्टी) का प्रतिबिम्बकम् → (यह जो मैं ईश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञा बना रहा हूँ) उसी शिवदृष्टी का प्रतिबिम्ब है — उसी की यह परछायी है - हुबहु फोटू है॥
(The reflection of the wisdom taught by Somananda) in

N. B. With the disappearance of most of the Shiva-Shastras the world became engrossed in spiritual darkness, Shiva took Pity on men and, appearing on the Kailasa mountain in the form of Shrikantha, Commanded the Sage Durvasa to Spread in the world the Knowlege of these Shastras again. Durvas created by the Power of his mind three Sons — Tryambaka, Amardaka & Shrinatha by names — whom he charged with the mission of establishing spiritual order and of teaching men again the ancient and eternal Shaiva faith and doctrine in Their three aspects of ~~Abheda~~ Abheda, Bheda and Bhedābheda — of Unity, Diversity and Diversity-in-Unity. Tryambaka was to teach the first, Amardaka the second and Shrinatha the last. It is this Abheda - or Advaya Shaiva teaching, thus taught ~~by~~ to the world by Tryambaka, which spoken as Trika

and Somanand decends from Trijambaka line.

अनुत्तरानन्य साक्षि पुमर्थोपायमभ्यधात् ।
ईश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञाख्यं यः शास्त्रं यत्सुनिर्मलम् ॥३॥
तत्प्रशिष्यः करोम्येतां तत्सूत्र विवृतिं लघुम् ।
बुद्ध्वाभिनव गुप्तोऽहं श्रीमल्लक्ष्मण गुप्ततः ॥४॥

अनुत्तर = बिना उत्तर के, सर्वोत्तम अनन्य साक्षि = जिसका कोई साक्षी नहीं है, स्व संविद् स्वरूप
पुमर्थोपायम = मोक्ष का उपाय,
अभ्यधात् = कहनेलगा, ~~नाम स्व~~ ईश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञाख्यं = ईश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञा नाम वाला (शास्त्र) यत् = जो
सुनिर्मलम् → जो यह ईश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञा नामक शास्त्र है अत्यन्त निर्मल है प्रशिष्यः = शिष्य का शिष्य
तत् = उस शास्त्र करोम्य = करता हूं
तत्सूत्र विवृतिं = उतपलदेवने जो सूत्र बनाये हैं उन कारिकाओं की विवृती को लघुम = सरल बनता हूं, बुद्ध्वा = जान कर, पढ कर अहं अभिनवगुप्तो मैं अभिनव गुप्त, श्रीमल्लक्ष्मण गुप्ततः = लक्ष्मण गुप्त से जानकर, पढ कर, अपने गुरु से (Abhinava Gupta being disciple of Laxman Gupta).

(इस ~~ब~~ ईश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञा नामक शास्त्र जो अत्यन्त निर्मल है और मोक्ष का संकेत है अतः ~~जिस~~ जो स्वसंविद् रूप है, ~~जिस~~ जो सर्वोत्तम है इस को मैं ने अपने गुरु लक्ष्मण गुप्त से जाना है, पढा है, इस शास्त्र ~~की~~ के सूत्र जो थे वह बडे गुढ थे आसानी से समझ नही पाते थे ~~उन सूत्रा~~ और यहाँ जो मेरे गुरु के गुरु

उतपलदेव ने बनाये है मैं ने इन (सूत्रों) की सरल वृति बनाई है)

वृत्त्या तात्पर्यं टीकया तद्विचार:
सूत्रेष्वेतेषु ग्रंथकारेण दृब्धम् ।
तस्मात्सूत्रार्थं मन्दबुद्धीन्प्रतीत्थं
सम्यग्व्याख्यास्ये प्रत्यभिज्ञा विविक्त्यै ॥५॥

वृत्त्या = वृति क्या है → तात्पर्य → भावार्थ, वृति से भावार्थ प्रतीत होता है, टीकया तत् विचार: → टीका से वृति का पूरा विचार होता है (Vrati Conveys brief purport & Tekia gives detailed explaination)
सूत्रेष्वेतेषु = इन सूत्रों को ग्रंथकारेण = ग्रंथकार ने, उतपलदेव ने, दृब्धम् = जोड़ा है compiled by
तस्मात्सूत्रार्थं = इन सूत्रों का अर्थ जो उतपलदेव ने किया है, मन्दबुद्धीन् = जिन की अल्पबुद्धि हो अप्रतीत्थं = उन की समझ से बाहिर होने के कारण ~~सम्य~~ सम्यग्व्याख्यास्ये = यह व्याख्या (विवृति) अच्छी प्रकार, पूरी तरह से ये प्रत्तभिज्ञा = इस प्रत्यभिज्ञा के, विविक्त्यै → विचार के ~~लि~~ लिऐ

From Baskari :-

~~वृत्त्या~~ → यतो ग्रंथकारेण → प्रत्यभिज्ञासूत्रकारेण श्रीमदुत्पलदेवेन,
वृत्त्या — तात्पर्यमात्रे वर्तते वृत्ति:, लक्षणया तन्निष्ठो ग्रन्थो वृत्ति:,
तात्पर्यम् — अत्राभिप्राये एतानि सूत्राणि प्रवृत्तानीत्ययमर्थ:,
दृब्धम् = ग्रन्थेन कथितम् ।
तद्विचार: = ~~अत्र~~ तात्पर्य विवेक: तस्मात् = तत: कारणात्
अहम् अभिनवगुप्ताख्य: सूत्राणाम् — कारिकाणाम् -
अर्थम् = वाच्यार्थम्, इत्थम् = अनेन वक्ष्यमाणेन प्रकारेण

सम्यक = स्फुटं कृत्वा, मन्दबुद्धीन् अपि = वृत्त्या टीकया तत् टीकया च सूत्रार्थ बोधेऽसमर्थ बुद्धीन् उद्दिश्य,
व्याख्यास्ये = व्याख्याविषयतां नेष्यामि - (व्याख्या करने लगा हूँ)
प्रत्यभिज्ञायाः = अत्र वाच्यभूतस्य स एव ईश्वरोऽहमिति भात भासमान अनुसन्धानस्य.
विविक्त्यै - विवेचनार्थम्.

सर्वत्राल्पमतौ यद्वा कुत्रापि सुमहाधियि ।
न वा अन्यत्रापि तु स्वात्मन्येषा स्यादुपकारिणी. ॥६॥

एषा = यह जो सूत्रों की व्याख्या की जा रही है
सर्वत्राल्पमतौ → सर्वेषु मन्द बुद्धिषु - उन सारे ही अल्प बुद्धि वालों के लिए
(एतेन स्वस्य महाग्रन्थकरणे प्रवृत्ताभिमानो निरस्तः)
कुत्रापि = सुमहाधियोऽपि दुर्लभत्वं ज्ञापयन् 'कुत्रापि'
(ऐसे लोग मिलने भी मुश्किल हैं)
• (फिर किस के लिए) → "अपि तु"
एषा स्वात्मनि → स्वस्मिन्नुत्पत्त्या भक्त्य आवेशेन च स्वात्म-तुल्येषु पुत्रादिषु शिष्येषु च,
उपकारिणी = विनोद बोध धारणोपकार कारिणी,
स्यात् = हो.

(2-4) Having been taught by Lakshmanagupta, I, Abhinavagupta, grand-disciple of Him, who wrote the flawless work, called ईश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञा, am writing this brief commentary on his (Utpala's) work, the work which is a representation of the system of Somananda, a gem in the family of Tryambaka, and is a means to the attainment of the purely subjective supreme human goal.

(5) Of this work, the author himself has given the substance in the Vṛtti and exposition in the Ṭīkā. I, therefore, in order to elucidate the concept of Recognition to people of slow understanding, shall fully explain the contents of the work as follows:-

(6) May this exposition be helpful to all people of slow understanding, or to some of them understandings, but if to none, at least to myself.

Desiring to bring about in others the identification with the Highest Reality, the power of which he had himself realised within, and thinking that it could safely be brought about if he starts with referring to his own identification, the author, with a view to make others fit for the same, states the object. Here, (in this verse) the statement of the object occupies a subordinate position to (the statement of) the realisation of identity with the highest aspect of the ultimate:— * See [illegible] कर्तरि...

ग्रन्थकारः = (उत्पलदेव) ग्रंथ कर्तृभूतः श्रीमान उत्पलदेवः

अपरोक्षात्मनि = अपने आप में ही प्रत्यक्ष
-इष्ट स्वसंवेदन सिद्ध साक्षात्‌ यथा भवति तथा।

शक्तिकां = आत्मनिष्ठा शक्तिः
शक्तियों का देखना

परमेश्वर तन्मयतां =
देह प्राणादौ तद्रूपता तिरस्कारेण प्रकाश-रूपता सम्पादनेन स्वरूपतां
(भगवान के अनुग्रह से परमेश्वर के साथ तन्मयता-भाव पाकर)

परत्र = दूसरों पर भी, (शिष्यादौ), जनविषये

संचे क्रमयिषु = संक्रामयितुं इच्छुः, प्रत्यभिज्ञोपायेन संक्रामयितुं चित्ते स्फुरणशीलां कर्तुमिच्छन्॥
(ताकि दूसरों को भी परमेश्वर तन्मयता भाव तर जाये यही इच्छा लेकर)

स्वस्य यत्तादात्म्यम्-परमेश्वरेण तन्मयता-तस्य समर्पणम्॥

स्वतादात्म्य समर्पण पूर्वम् = येन अहं एकाकी संपदा परत्र (अशुद्ध प्रमातृत्वपि) परमेश्वर तन्मयताम संक्रमण संक्रमेणेच्छा॥
(अपना जो तादात्म्यभाव वही अर्पण करते हुये)

, अविघ्नेन = विघ्न रहित, सुखेन

मन्यमानः = अत एव तत्कुर्वाण इति शेषः

तत्सम्पत्तिं मन्यमानः = (उसी के सिद्धि के लिए) और यही मानते हुए, जैसे परमेश्वर तन्मयता सिद्धिम्

परमेश्वर उत्कर्ष = परमेश्वर का उद्घापन

प्रह्वता = (प्रणाम) प्रकर्षेण ह्वयति शब्दयति अन्यतिरस्कारेण तद्रूपे परामिशति तद्गुणानुप्रवेश स्पर्धावानेव इति प्रह्वति॥
(मित प्रमातृभाव को तिरस्कार करते हुए और तन्मयता भाव के परामर्श से उसी की ओर "जय" शब्द करना- * जो ही उत्कर्ष है उसी की जय है). यही प्रणाम होता है। ह्वत → शब्द करना

परामर्श शेषतया = केवल यही परामर्श ही प्रयोजन होने से

परमेश्वर तदात्म्य योग्यता आपादन बुद्ध्या प्रयोजनम् =
केवल शुद्ध संविद् के साथ एकीभाव - तदात्म्यभाव
हासिल करनी - और इसी ही बुद्धि, केवल इसी
प्रयोजन को लेकर यह सूत्र बांदता है॥

कथंचिदासाद्य महेश्वरस्य
दास्यं जनस्याप्युपकारमिच्छन् ।
समस्तसंपत्समवाप्तिहेतुं
तत्प्रत्यभिज्ञामुपपादयामि ॥१॥

योजना :

कथंचित् महेश्वरस्य दास्यं आसाद्य, जनस्य उपकारम् अपि इच्छन्, समस्तसंपत् समवाप्तिहेतुः (तत्) प्रत्यभिज्ञाम् उपपादयामि ॥

कथंचित् = परमेश्वर प्रसादादेव अथवा स्वात्मनः प्रसादादेव, Somehow unexpectedly.

महेश्वरस्य दास्यं = ~~महेश्व~~ ईश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञादर्शनस्य पात्रताम्, अथवा स्वातन्त्र्यपात्रताम्, deservedness to serve the Lord.

(दीयते अस्मै स्वामिना सर्वं यथा अभिलषितमिति दासः। तस्य भावः दास्यं) (competence)

आसाद्य = परिपूर्णतया सादयित्वा अथा स्वयं लब्ध्वा Having attained.

~~स~~ परमेश्वर = पर-मा-ईश्वर परा ~~स~~ अवस्था से जो विश्व वैचित्र्य आभास दिखलावे ऐसी ही लक्ष्मी अथवा शोभा जिस की है

जनस्य = संपत्तिरहितस्य तस्मात् पारतन्त्र्यादि दुखैः पीडितस्य अखिलस्य लोकस्य Humanity at large.

उपकारमिच्छन् = येन परस्यापि परमार्थ लाभेन परितुष्येम् - desirous to do good.

समस्त संपत्समवाप्ति हेतुं = सर्व ऐश्वर्यं तस्य, स्वातन्त्र्य-संपत्ति-रूपा-सिद्धिः तस्याः, सम्यग् विमर्शरूढिः सर्वैः हेतुः, ताम् ॥ पूर्णताादि

The means to completely achieve.

तत् = तस्य महेश्वरस्य; स्वात्मनः वा . तस्य = महेश्वरस्य

प्रत्यभिज्ञाम् उपपादयामि (संपादयामि) - सिद्ध करता हूँ
am setting forth to propound the Re-Cognition

प्रत्यभिज्ञा = प्रतीप आत्माभिमुखेनत्वं ज्ञाने प्रकाशः प्रत्यभिज्ञा ॥

अथवा प्रतीपं ज्ञातस्यापि विस्मृतस्येव छादितस्येव पुनः अभिमुखं नतु स्मर्यमाणतया अपि तु स्फुटत्वेन ज्ञाने प्रत्यभिज्ञानं....

अथवा भात-भासमानरूपानुसंधानात्मिका, स एवायं चैत्र इति प्रतिसंधानेन अभिमुखी भूते वस्तुनि ज्ञानम् ..... । ×.

Having attained the Grace of the Lord, somehow through His devoted service and desirous of doing good to the humanity at large I am setting forth to propound the doctrine of Re-Cognition — the means of completely achieving the wealth Svatantrya-Sampati (the all pervasive power of Independence, Knowlege and Action of Lord) — in short the identity ~~with the~~ of Self with the Lord Himself.

·×· Recognition consists in the unification of what appeared before with what appears now, as in the judgement :- "This is the same Chaitra, (known before

इहापि प्रसिद्ध पुराण सिद्धान्तागमानुमानादि विदित पूर्ण- शक्तिस्वभावे ईश्वं सति स्वात्मन्यभिमुखी-भूते तत्प्रतिसंधानेन ज्ञानम् उदेति, नूनं स एव ईश्वरोऽहम् - इति (PV-1, 20, 21).

The Lord as possessed of Supreme power is known from the puranas, Sidhantas, Agmas as well as reasoning, inference etc and the Self is a fact of everybody's experience. Recognition arises when the two experiences, the knowlege of the Lord as Supreme power and the awareness of ones' own ·×·

·×· Self are unified in ones' experience: "Certainly I am the very Lord".

नमस्कार का अर्थः-

इह = इस शिवमार्ग में

परमेश्वरं प्रति → परमेश्वर संबन्धी

या इयं = जो यह

कायवाङ्मनसां = शरीर, वानी और मन से *

Surrender ← प्रह्वता = प्रणाम सा = सा प्रह्वता
→ प्रह्वी भावः

अर्थः = अभिधेयम्

* तत्र प्रह्वतायाः कायेनाष्टांग प्रणतिरूपत्वम्, वाचा उच्चारणम्, मनसा परामर्शी विषयत्वमिति विभागो ज्ञेयः

तदेकः → सः एकः – परमेश्वरः

विषयः – आलम्बनं यस्या सा तस्या भावः तदेक विषया

तस्यां नियोजना = प्रेरणा

सा लक्षणम् = स्वरूप – यस्या सा तादृशी प्रह्वीभावः

सा → प्रह्वता

तथा → तदा – तब ही

प्रामाणिकस्य = प्रेक्षापूर्वकारिणः – उद्बुद्ध पुरुष की तब ही एसा प्रणाम सिद्ध होता है, युक्ती जानने वाले को
Can be view only when.

सर्वतः = सर्वेभ्यः जडाजडेभ्यः

नमस्कारणीयस्य – जिसको नमस्कार करे – नमस्कार के युग्य जो है, त्रिविधनमस्कारविषयी कं तुम आरब्धस्य॥

When he realises the superiority of the object of his devotion & above all others.

उत्कर्षं पश्येत →
सर्वैः गुणैः श्रेष्ठताम् .

'अन्यथा = उत्कर्ष दर्शनाभावे — इस उत्कर्षिता का दर्शन जब न हो

यस्मिम् = उत्कर्ष नमस्कारणरूपाम् — शुद्ध विद्यारूप तर्क रूप परामर्श जब न हो

अपरामृशतः = अविचारयतः

अपरमार्थरूपेऽपि = बौद्धसांख्यादीनां बुद्धि पुरुष तत्त्वादौ इव,
माथाधिकारिणी ब्रह्मविष्णुवादौ वा ॥
जैसे बौद्ध, सांख्यादौ का नमस्कार — वह सब मायाधिकारी है

नमस्कारोद्यतस्य = नमस्कारे प्रवृत्तस्य

सांसारिक पशु जन मध्य पातित्वमेव → सांसारिको यो जनः :—
धनादिलोभेन राजादौ नमस्कारोद्यतः तत्सदृशत्वमिति यावत ॥
(वैसे नमस्कार संसारिक पशुजनों के जैसे हैं — परामर्शहीन जहां ~~मध्य~~ परमेश्वर की उत्कर्षता का भान नहीं है)

'न विन्दन्ति परं देवं विद्यारागेण रञ्जिताः'
(जो विद्या और राग से रंगे गये हैं वह परं देव को प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते हैं)

~~वैष्णव~~ वैष्णव बौद्ध प्रभृतयः ते सर्वे किञ्चत् ज्ञत्वरूपा शुद्धविद्यातत्त्वेन रागतत्त्वे च — ये अधरदर्शनेषु आसक्तिं नीताः सन्तः

परम देवं = समस्त तत्त्व उत्तीर्णम् क्रीडाशीलम् ॥ ~~तेन~~ ...अयं

विन्दन्ति = स्वेष्टदेवताभावेन न लभन्ते

तावति हि = इन की स्थिति केवल पुरुष तत्त्व आदि पर ही होने से

तथा मायीय अशुद्ध विद्या राग कला संचार्य माणस्य पशुत्वमेव।
(माया अशुद्ध विद्या और कला तत्त्व पर ही स्थिति होने के कारण यह पशुओं के समान समझने चाहिये).

कतिपय = कुछ, Some, Several others.

अधरोत्तीर्णतया = निचले से उच्च वाले तत्त्व - पद पर स्थिति ~~करने वाले~~ रखनी ही

समुत्कर्षी स्यात् — अस्तु नाम — हो उन के लिए ऐसी उत्कर्षिता।

तदुक्तम्

"कस्य नाम करणैरकृत्रिमैः
पश्यतस्तव विभूतिमक्षताम् ।
विभ्रमादवरतोऽपि जायते
त्वां व्युदस्य वरद स्तुतिस्पृहा ॥"

जैसे "श्रीविद्याधिपतिना" में कहा है ॥

*अन्यथाभावेऽपि परमार्थः

अकृत्रिमैः = त्वद्विभूतिमयत्वेन सहजैः | करणैः = बाह्यान्तः करणैः

तव = ते संवर्धिनीम्

पश्यतः = स्वभाव बलेन गृह्णतः

विभूतिम = ३६ तत्त्व रूपी ऐश्वर्यः अक्षताम् = सम्पूर्णाम्

कस्य नाम = वैष्णवादेः अधरदर्शनस्थस्यापि

विभ्रमाद् = भ्रम से अवरतोऽपि = देवाभासे देवत्वज्ञान-विपर्यज्ञानाद अपि इति रूपात् । अर्थः

त्वां व्युदस्य = आप को छोड़ कर, भवन्तं त्यक्त्वा

स्तुतिस्पृहा = स्तुति की इच्छा, स्तुत्याकांक्षा

जायते = न कस्यापीत्यर्थः, अन्य देवता निष्ठा अपि परमार्थतस्-त्वन्निष्ठा एवेति भावः

यत्स्वयं भगवतोक्तम् :-

"ये यथा मां प्रपद्यन्ते तांस्तथैव ~~भज~~ भजाम्यहम्"

एतच्च आगमकाण्डे निरूपयिष्यामः → ईश्वर का उत्पन्न जो नमस्कार-करनी है वह उस का आगे आगमकाण्ड में निरूपन किया जायेगा ॥

तस्मात् ...... स्वीकार्यम →

तस्मात् = इस कारण निखिल उत्कर्ष = निखिलभ्यो उत्कर्षः ऊर्ध्वपदस्यत्वम्

तत्र स्वीकार्यम = उसी तरह का नमस्कार स्वीकार करनी है ॥

यद्यपि = Not with standing

आयात = उत्पन्न हुवा भी हो दृढेश्वर शक्तिपातस्य = जिस की तीव्र शक्तिपात भी हुवा हुवा हो

स्वयमेव = अपने आप ही

इयती → स्वान्तःकृत समस्त तत्त्वा

परमशिवभूमिरभ्येति = परमशिव अवस्था सन्मुख

हृदय गोचरम् = विमर्श विषय बनती है — स्वसंवेदनवेद्यतम्

अत्र = परमेश्वर के उत्कर्ष के स्फुरणे में

स्वात्मीयः पुरुषकारः = अपनी कोई हिम्मत - उत्साह

निर्वहति = प्रगल्भते - समर्थ है

सर्वस्य तस्य = उन सब भेदरूप उपायों में मायामयत्वेन = मायास्वरूप होने

→ अन्धतमस → माया रूप होने से वह उपाय घने अंधकार से स्वरूप हैं

प्रख्या — प्रकाशः स्वात्म प्रकाश अमायीय है ~~अ प्रम~~

शुद्ध प्रकाश रूप जो हो उस का अन्धेरा पात्र है - अन्धेरा और प्रकाश एक दूसरे के उलटे है (स्वप्रतिद्वन्द्विने).

उपायता अनुपपत्ते = ~~उपय~~ उपाय भाव इस से सिद्ध नहीं होती है

तथापि तथाविधम् = उत्कर्षगुणपरामर्शनीयम्

तदेव रूपं → प्रक्रान्तं परमेश्वरस्वरूपमेव न तु अन्यद् अपि किञ्चित्, अस्य तत्सृष्टत्वेन सर्वोत्कृष्टत्वायोगात्- निःशेषेभ्यो यः उत्कर्षः — ऊर्ध्वपदस्थत्वम्, तस्य यः विशेष - तादृशः यो जय इति आदि शब्दः-

प्रख्या = स्वप्रतिपत्ति, स्वात्मावभासविषयीभावः अन्तः.

उपाख्या = परप्रतिबोधनम् * अन्तः स्फुरितं हि स्वात्मनैव विषयीकर्तुं शक्यते ॥

* परावभासन विषयीभावः

तथा च → स्फुटमुच्चारितस्य शब्दस्यार्थं हि परोऽपि ज्ञानविषयीकरोति ॥

स्वात्मपरावभासविषयभाव = पर अवभास को स्वात्म विषयरूप से देखना - यही समावेश होता है

जिगमिषया = मैं ऐसे ही जानने की इच्छा से

निःशेषोत्कर्ष = निःशेषेभ्यो यः उत्कर्षः — ऊर्ध्वपदस्थत्वम् -

~~-विषय→~~

विशेषाभिधायि → तस्य यः विशेषः तमभिधाति — तादृशः - नामक

यो जयत्यादि शब्दः — आदिग्रहणेनाऽन्येषां पर्यायाणां ग्रहणम् ॥

तस्य यो अनुवेधः - तस्य या व्याप्तिः तेन - मानसिक ततु उच्चार परामर्श द्वारेण

परामर्शनीयम् - विमर्शविषयीकार्यम्

कया हेतुभूतया? → प्रख्या - प्रकृष्टज्ञानरूपः आन्तरः, वाच्यविषयः परामर्शः, उपाख्या - तत्समीपवर्ती स्फुटः तद्वाचकनिष्ठः उच्चारः, तयोर्यः क्रमः तेन, स्वात्मपरावभासविषयीभावं गन्तुमिच्छया गच्छत्वित्येवं रूपा तया —

इति = अतः कारणात् नमस्कारे =

जयत्यर्थ आक्षेप्यः = जय पद का ही विमर्श (अर्थ) करना चाहिये ।
(Should be stretched i.e. emphasized)

जयपदस्य यदुदीरणम् – उच्चारणम् तत्र

तादृश = ऐसा समुत्कर्ष अतिशय शालिनि → जय पद जो ऐसे उच्च उत्कर्ष की अतिशय से शोभित है लेकिन →

स्वात्मानम – अपने स्वरूप को।

अप्रह्वीकर्वाणस्य = न नमस्कार करनी है (स्वात्म विमर्श-रूप)

तटस्थत्वम् → विमर्शहीन – नमस्काराकरण रूपं ज्ञेयम्

यह है → परम अनात्मोपकारित्वम् = यह केवल अनात्म-भाव है और अनात्म भाव का ही इस से उपकार होता है ।।

इति = अतः कारणात्

नमस्कारोऽवश्यम् अभ्यन्तरी कार्यः = जय पद का भीतर से उच्चारण और नमस्कार अवश्य रूप अन्तःकरण से विमर्श रूप कार्य है (स्वात्म स्वरूप के साथ समावेश) का नाम नमस्कार है ।।

इत्यनया – युक्त्या =
इस सूक्ष्म युक्ति से

जय - नमस्कार .... अवश्यमङ्गीकर्तव्या =
जय शब्द का उच्चारण आरम्भ करके साथ ही मन से नमस्कार कार का अर्थ (उत्कर्ष रूप) अङ्गीकार करना चाहिये।

प्रह्वता च उत्कर्षणं च तथा प्रकाश परामर्शरूपं मानसे संवेदने तत्साररूपे च वाक्तत्त्वे विश्रान्तम् । (I.P.V. F.N. 15 Page 8)

वन्दन-नमन .... इयमेव वर्तनी =

वन्दन, नमन, स्मरण, ध्यान और और शब्दों के प्रयोग में भी इसी तरह जय शब्द के अर्थ को ही अङ्गीकार करना चाहिये

अन्नार्थं = इस श्लोक में ग्रन्थकृता = उत्पलदेव ने, ग्रन्थकार ने

तादृक प्रक्रम आश्रितः =
ऐसा ही सर्वातिशय रूप तरीका ठहराया है।

यत्र = जहां - जिस तरीका में

इयम् = जयार्थः नमस्कारार्थ एव इति अर्थः
(नमनोत्कर्षरूपम्)

स्वशब्देन = स्ववाचक शब्देन

परामृष्टम् = परामर्श विषयी कृतम्

एतत् च = यह बात

पदार्थ व्याख्यानावसरे = जिस समय श्लोक का पदार्थ हम करेंगे

प्रकटीभविष्यति = प्रकट करेंगे

By means of conventional expression
स्वशब्दपरामर्शः - स्वशब्द का परामर्श ही का ग्रन्थकार ने क्यों प्रयोग किया

सर्वजनहितत्वात = स्वशब्द में स्वात्म स्वरूप का परामर्श है जिस अपने आप का स्वरूप पर वित्तियों में देख कर दोनों का एवम् सर्वजनों का उपकार वितीत होता है॥

स हि सर्वस्यैव झटिति हृदयंगमः = ऐसी युक्ति सुप्रबुद्ध, अप्रबुद्ध सब को आसानी से सूझ जाती है ॥

ननु किं तर्हि अर्थाक्षिप्तस्य (the implied meaning) सर्वथा हृदयंगमत्वं नास्तीत्याह :-

"कतिचिदेव" → स्वप्रतिभोदित वाक्तत्त्व आमर्श युक्तान् कांश्चिदेव प्रति

"स्वप्रतिभा" सर्वेषाम इति शेषः। स्वस्य या प्रतिभा - नव नवोल्लेखशालिनी बुद्धिः तया उदितो यः वाक्तत्त्वावमर्शः - वाक्तत्त्व विषयः अवमर्शः परामर्शः तस्यासंभवात्।

प्रकाशस्य अप्रकाशकल्पत्वात् = सद्योजातबालदीपदर्शनस्य यथाऽदर्शन - सदृशत्वं भवति तथाऽप्रकाशसदृशत्वात् इति अर्थः ॥

अग्रे = ~~स्वरं~~ "स्वभावमवभासस्य" इति कारिकायाम्।

तत् = तस्मात् कारणात् अनेन = सर्वहृदयंगमतारूपेण

इमाम् = स्वशब्द परामर्शरूपाम

प्रसिद्ध जय - नमः प्रभृति शब्द = जो यह प्रसिद्ध शब्द है

शय्य → इन पर जो ठहराव था

अनाश्लेषण = उन के साथ न मेल करने से, उन का प्रयोग न करना

इमाम् सरणिम् → स्वशब्द परामर्शरूपाम सरणि - रास्ता, तरीका

ग्रन्थकारः स्म अनुसरति →

ग्रन्थकार ने अच्छा तरह से यही रास्ता पकड लिया है ॥

इह = इस जगत में यद्यत्किंचित् = यद्यत्किंचित भावजातम्
स्फुरति = भासते तत् तत् ----- = वक्ष्यमाणप्रच प्रसौ ईश्वरस्य
स्वात्मा तद्रूपा या प्रथा - प्रकाशः तन्मात्रम्.
तद्वदहमिति परामर्शमात्र विषयत्वयोग्यत्वात् इति
तत्र = स्फुरणशील भाव जात मध्ये अर्थः
"तु" = व्यतिरेके

उपाय-उपेय भाव प्रभृतिः → कार्यकारणभावोऽपि
→ ज्ञाप्य ज्ञापक भावादि
यथा प्रकाशम् = प्रकाशभाव अनतिक्रमेण न तु मायीयेन
स्वेन रूपेण इति अर्थः
सत्य भूत भूतत्वे हेतुमाह "प्रकाश" इति
अनपह्नवनीयत्वात् = यतः प्रकाशमानस्य केनाप्यपह्नवो न
कर्तुं शक्यते ततः प्रकाशमानस्य
कार्यकारणभावस्यापि परमार्थभूतत्वमित्य
अर्थः
तत्र तु = समस्त कार्यकारणभाव मध्य - लौकिके बीजादौ
क्वचित् = लौकिके बीजादौ

स्वातन्त्र्यलक्षनम् = सर्वत्रानन्युमुख प्रेक्षित्व स्वरूपम्
माहेश्वर्यम = महेश्वरभावः
नान्तरीयकता = स्वव्याप्यतया
क्रोडीकृत = स्वान्तःकृतम् अनन्त शक्तिचक्रम् = शक्ति समूहः
तेन चुम्बिताः = समयुक्तम् - स्पृष्टा - सार भावेन स्थित्वा -
व्याप्ता, ये भावा = पदार्थाः तैः भावितम् = प्रकटीकृतम्
यत्प्रथान्तरम् = शुद्ध प्रकाशव्यतिरेकेण स्वविषयं ज्ञानम्,
तेन व्यवधानम् = तत्कृतं परमेश्वररूप स्वात्माऽस्फुरणम्,

चकास्तिः = स्फुरति . अन्यथा सर्वत्र प्रकाशपरमार्थत्वेऽस्येदं कार्यमस्येदं कारणम् इति विभाग अयोगात् इति भावः॥

व्यवस्थापयिष्यते = इहैवाग्र इति शेषः
यह हम आगे बतलायेंगे॥

यत्र तु शुद्ध ...... = व्यतिरिक्त प्रथनीयाऽरूषता या स्वात्म-रूपा च प्रथा — अवभासः॥ अलौकिक कारणकार्य भाव मे

तदात्मकः यः अनुत्तरशक्ति शाली — सर्वोतिशायि स्वातन्त्र्य-शक्तिभूषितः,

निरर्गलः = अच्छिन्न प्रसरः

स्वात्मप्रकाशः = स्वात्मरूपः प्रकाशः न तु बाह्यप्रकाशः

~~च~~ मायीय प्रथान्तर व्यवधान = माया के कारण - अपने ही स्वतन्त्र्य से जो भेद से शुद्ध स्वरूप का व्यवधान है

बन्धो = रहित , उस ~~च~~ व्यवधान से रहित जो स्वरूप है

निबन्धने = कारणम् , सार भावेन स्थित्वा स्वरूपोत्पादकं कारणम्

तत्र = तस्मिन कार्यकारण भावे

अनुग्रह = स्वात्मीकरणम्

एष च = यही है पञ्चमः परमेश्वरः कृत्यविशेषः = परमेश्वर के जो पांच कार्य है (सृष्टि, स्थिति, लय, पिधान, अनुग्रह) उन मे अन्त्यः ~~च~~ आखीरी पांच वा

परपुरुषार्थ प्रापकः = मोक्षाख्यस्य पुरुषसंबन्धि-परमप्रयोजनस्य प्रापकः = प्राप्ति कारी

स च इह दास्यासादन रूप एव ज्ञेयः॥

परमार्थमोक्षस्य = पर प्रमातृ धाम को प्राप्त करने का

तत् = वही अनुग्रह शक्ति ही

निबन्धनत्वात् = कारण होने से

अन्यत्र = बौद्ध सिद्धान्तादिषु भव: कुर्ण कुतश्चित = मायादेस्तत्वात्
नतु शुद्ध विद्यादेरपि ॥

मुक्ति = केवल ऐसी मुक्ति जिसे अपवर्ग कहते हैं - यहां हर प्रकार से भेद नही मिटता

अपवर्ग: = परम गति, मोक्ष, final beatitude.

न सर्वत = सर्वतो बन्धस्य अविगलणात्

इति निःश्रेयसाभास इति वक्ष्यमा: ॥

इस लिए हम इस को केवल मुक्ति का आभास मात्र ही कहते हैं ॥

स च अयं = यह कार्यकारण भाव जो है वा यह अलौकिक है ॥ अस्यैव कार्यकारणभावस्य कथंचिदिति - शब्द प्रवृत्ति निमित्तत्वं परामृशति स च अयमिति ॥

द्वितीयः = दूसरा लोकप्रसिद्ध कार्यकारण भाव जो है

यह कार्यकारण भाव -

अन्वय व्यतिरेक प्रसिद्धः = जब मिट्टी हो तब ही घट बनता है (अन्वय) जब मिट्टी न हो घट भी नही है (व्यतिरेक)

विलक्षणात् = अलौकिक कार्य कारण भाव दूसरे अन्वय-व्यतिरेक-प्रसिद्ध कार्यकारण भाव से निराला है -

स्फुटेन रूपेण असंचेत्यमानः = स्फुट रूप से ग्रहण नही हो सकता - अतिसूक्ष्मत्वेन ग्रहीतुम शक्यः

ननु तर्हि कथमसौ सत्त्वेन ज्ञायते इति आह :-

कदाचित्क = कदाचिद्भवः, अकस्मात् भव समावेशादौ व्यथानादौ तद्भावत्वात् ॥

यो वस्तु सद्भावः = परमार्थ मोक्षसद्भावः
तेनोन्नीयः = ज्ञातुं शक्यः - परमार्थः = सत्यं स्वरूपं यस्य
तादृशः - कार्यमात्र गम्य
(यद्यपि परमार्थतः सर्वदा स्थितस्य परमार्थमोक्षस्य इति अर्थः
कार्यत्वं न संभवति तथापि तद्बोधापसारणार्थम् आरोप्य
एवमुक्तम्। तत्रापि मुच्यमानविषये एव अस्य सत्त्व ज्ञानम्
न अन्यविषये। अन्यविषयेऽस्य मोक्षस्य अस्फुरणात्)

अस्यैव कार्यकारणभावस्य कथंचित् इति शब्द प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तत्वे साधयति :-
"कथंचिद्" :-
"अतिदुर्घट" :- अति दुर्घट कारित्वे च स्वात्मतया स्थितस्य
विश्वस्य भिन्नतया भासने भासितस्य तु पुनः स्वात्मभावेः
विमर्शनम् इति द्विविधम्॥

तत् लक्षणैश्वर्यम् = तत्स्वरूपं यदैश्वयम्
तस्य विजृम्भा = विलासनं तया भावितः = संपादितः
अद्भुतभावः = आश्चर्यकारित्वं यस्य तादृशः
प्रथम कोटि संभावना शून्यः = अनादि, पिधानेव आभेदयः
कालिकाकारम् = मेघमालावद् आकार युक्तम्
यत् स्वप्रकाश आवरणम् = आत्मप्रकाश आवरण भूता माया शक्तिः
(यहां तीनों मल या तीन मे से कोई
मौजूद है यही कालिक आवरण है

तस्य निराकरणम् = अपसारणम्
तस्य यानि मनोरथ शतानि = ~~कर्तुं~~ उस का अपसारण हजारों मनोरथ
भी कियों न कोई करे तो दुष्प्राप्य है
उसी दुष्प्राप्य मनोरथ का ~~प्राप्त~~ प्राप्त होना — "अनुग्रह" है

इत्येवं प्रकारः = प्रोक्त प्रकार रूपः, अनुग्रहरूप इति यावत्

कथमा → यह शब्द निपात शब्द यानी चित् शब्द के मेलन का द्योतक है यानी कथं के साथ चित् शब्द के मेल की सूचना देता है।

कथमा → कथम् इति व्ययेन (mutation, changing verb) द्योतक निपात सहितेन = चिद् शब्दमेलितेन.

निरूपितः = सूचितः (उपायजालं न, शिवेश प्रकाशयते)

द्योतकसहितं कथमित्य-व्ययमेव दर्शयति? कथंचिदिति

यह ऊपर वाला अलौकिक अर्थः है

लौकिकमपि कथयति = केनचित् —

परमेश्वरघटितेनैव = शक्तिपातेन

संबन्धः = महागुरोर्भक्तिकलितस्य शिष्यस्य च ॥

(गुरु-शिष्य संबन्ध होना अतिदुर्घट है - जब तलक शक्ति-पात् समय नहीं आता सत्गुरु भी तब तक नहीं मिलता)

"आसाद्य" → आ = समन्तात् - परिपूर्णरूपतया

सादयित्वा — अंश अंश भाव से सब कुछ स्वरूप ही जान कर - यह सिद्ध करके

स्वात्मोपभोग योग्यता = स्वात्मस्वरूप के उपभोग की योग्यता

गमयित्वा = जान कर

(निरर्गला स्वात्मोपभोग योग्यता तु कर्मत्वेन आक्षिप्ता है सदेः णिजन्तस्य क्त्वाप्रत्यये रूपम्, अस्य धातोरनेकार्थत्वेपि गमनमात्रमाश्रित्येयं व्याख्या)

इयता = फलितमाह (इस दो निच् के होने से - पहिले दूसरे के मतलब के लिए दूसरे अपने मतलब के लिए,

विदितवेद्यत्वेन = जो सदोदित है उसी को वेद्य रूप रूप से दूसरे विदित कराना _

→ ज्ञातज्ञेयत्वेन

परार्थे = परार्थम् शास्त्रकरणे अधिकारः = शास्त्र बनाने का अधिकार

दर्शितः = स्वस्येति शेषः

अन्यथा = यदि पूर्णता न होती तो यह शास्त्र का बनाना केवल ठगबाज़ी ही थी॥ प्रतारकता = Fraudship ठगना

पौर्वकाल्येन = पूर्वकालतया

सामनन्तर्यम = दास्यासादन प्रत्यभिज्ञाशास्त्रोपपादनयोर्मध्ये व्यवधानराहित्यम्

अत्र = आसाद्य शब्द से - याने

~~विवि~~ विवक्षितम् = प्रकट किया गया है

अन्यथा = ~~साम~~ सामनन्तर्याभावे

तारतम्यप्राप्तौ = पराकाष्ठायां सत्याम् , तारतम्य प्राप्ति हि तारतम्य■स्यावसाने संभवति, अन्य तस्य यथोत्तरं स्थितस्य का प्राप्तिः। तारतम्यावसानमेव च तारतम्य पराकाष्ठा॥

(यह उपदेश - प्रतिभिज्ञाशास्त्र रूपी - तो तुरीय अवस्था में ही संभव है तुर्यातीत अवस्था में नहीं).

मयीय मल ...... प्रक्षये = जब ~~अन न~~ आनव मल संस्कार का भी नाश है वहां तो पर उपदेश असंभव है

संभवन्ति = ~~इनमें सम्भव होस~~ संभव क्रियाकृत्वं भजन्ति
= ऐसी उपदेश क्रिया कहां मुमकिन है ~~(सं~~
मायागर्भाधिकारिणो = माया में ही जो पड़े हैं
भेद ~~प्रथा~~ प्रधानत्वात् अशुद्धाः —

N.B. यद्यपि देहस्थितिं तावत् संस्कारस्य स्थितिर्युक्तैवाऽन्यथा तत्-पाताऽऽपातात्, तथापि शिष्यबोधनार्थमेवमुक्तम्। संस्कार-नाशे तु विदेहमुक्तिसमयभाविनि न परास्तिष्ठति, नापि तस्य करणीये उपदेशे शक्तिः। संस्कारं वावत् तु जीवन्मुक्तेषु भेदगलेऽपि परोऽपि तिष्ठति, करणीये तदुपदेशे शक्तिरपीति संस्कारपद परपद वाक्यपादानां ग्रहणम्॥.

कथं शाक्यक्रियः — कथं कर्तुं शाक्यः।

विष्णुविरिंचाद्याः = ब्रह्मा, विष्णु, महेश्वर आदि जो भेद प्रधानता के कारण माया गर्भ में ही फिर रहे हैं वह यह अधिकार रखते हैं -

तदुत्तीर्णा = उन से ऊपर

महामाया अधिकृता = शुद्धविद्या में जो Perceivers हैं वह कौन हैं — शुद्धाशुद्ध = भेदाभेद प्रधानत्वात्

शुद्धा अपि श्री सदाशिव प्रभृतयः = यहां इदन्ता का लेश काई नहीं इस लिए यह शुद्ध ~~मा माग~~ मार्गी है।
(इदन्ता न्यग्भावेन).

ते तु = वे सब यदीयैश्वर्यं = उस परम ~~शि~~ शिव के ऐश्वर्य के छोटे से टपके हुए बूंदों से

विप्रुड्भिः = लेशैः ईश्वरीभूताः अनीश्वराः सन्तः ईश्वराः सम्पन्नाः

यः प्रकाशानन्दः = प्रकाशरूपः आनन्दः -

तद्रूपम् - लक्षणया तत्परामर्शरूपम्, यत्स्वातन्त्र्यं तदेव परमार्थः (स्वभावमवभासस्य).

सहजः स्वभावो यस्य तादृशः, एतेनास्य भगवतः परमत्वे हेतु उक्तः

तस्य = परमेश्वरस्य "दास्यम्" - दास भावम्

"आसाद्य" इत्यस्य कर्मतया स्थितम्

उपपादनस्य = संपादनस्य .. महाफलत्वम् = महाफलभावम् (दास्यासादनं प्रति इति शेषः)

"दास्य" पद का अर्थ :-

"दीयते" = दिया जावे अस्मै = जिस पुरुष को

स्वामिना = स्वामी. सर्वं यथा अभिलषितम् = सब कुछ जो उस की इच्छा हो ॥

वह "दास" होता है ॥

तस्य भाव = य दास्य - दास भाव होता है ॥

अनेन = दास्य पदेन

परमेश्वर रूप स्वातन्त्र्य पात्रता उक्तम् = पारमेश्वर स्वातन्त्र्यैव सर्वत्वाद् इति भावः

"यः कश्चित् जायमानः" --

अधिकारि नियम निषेधपरमात्र वर्णविभागमपेक्ष्य कृतः ॥ यथा वेदान्तेष्वनुपनीतस्य त्रैवर्णिकस्यैवाधिकारस्तथा न इह इति ॥

यस्य यस्य = जिस किसी को चाहे वह किसी जाती का हो
इद स्वरूपप्रथनम् = प्रत्यभिरूपं ईश्वररूपं स्वात्म स्फुरणं,
महाफले = समस्त समप्र समवाप्ति रूप फल युक्ति युक्त दास्या-
साधनरूपं श्रेष्ठफलम् ॥

प्रथनस्यैव = स्वात्मस्वरूप का सच्चा ~~भास~~ भान ही महाफल
हे ॥

प्रतिबन्धक सम्मतैः = प्रतिबन्धकत्वेन मतैः
अनभ्यासादिभि

अप्रतिबन्धनीयत्वात् = प्रतिबन्ध विषयी कर्तुम
अशक्यत्वात् ॥

नहि प्रथितम अप्रथितम इति न्यायात् = जो हर
समय भात है वह अभात नही होसकता ॥
अन्थाऽग्निरपि कदाचिद्न ग्निर्भवेत् ॥

अभिक्रमनाशः = आरम्भनाशः

नहि → आत्माद्वैत ज्ञानयोगे स्वरूप प्रथने निष्काम
कर्माणि,

प्रत्यवायो न विद्यते = प्रतिबन्धको विघ्नः

एकवारं = सकृदेव   प्रमाणेन = स्वतो युक्तितः

ज्ञाते = सम्यक् परीक्षिते , अद्वैत भावनया अन्तः
नहि परामृष्टे

शिवत्वे = स्वात्मनिष्ठ शिवभावे

~~स्व~~ सर्वस्थे = हर चीज़ में वही ठहरा हुवा

प्रतिपत्त्या दृढात्मना = अतिबल विमर्शेन

करणेन = आसनबन्धेन , आसन मुद्रा बन्धादिना,

भावनयापि वा = द्वादशान्तादि भावनया

सकृत् = एक वारम्   भावनाकरणादिना = निकषघर्षणादिना

सर्वदा = सर्व कालम्

पितृमात्रादिभिः तुल्यम् = सदृशम्

किं सत्यता = किं सत्य सुवर्णत्वम् न भवति ॥

NB. (यथा सुवर्णे ज्ञाते, निकषपरीक्षादिना किं सत्यता भवति? प्रथमं निर्णीतत्वात् न भवत्येव, एवं सकृदेव स्वतो युक्तितः परस्माद्वा गुर्वादेः सकाशात् अचलविमर्शैन शिवत्वे ज्ञाते सति दृढ़शान्तादौ भावनया आसनबन्धादिना च कर्तव्यं नास्ति सकृद्भात तस्य विच्छेदाभावात् इति अर्थः).

कृपास्पदतया = करुणाश्रयत्वेन, कृपाविषयतया

उपकरणीयत्वम् = उपकार योग्यत्वे

तदभिन्नताम् — स्वस्याभेदम्

आविष्कुर्वन् = प्रकट करते हुए

स्वात्मनि परार्थ संपत्त्य = केवल स्वात्मा के उपकार के लिए जिसमें परउपकार भी प्राप्त है

अतिरिक्त प्रयोजनान्तरम् = और कोई प्रयोजन नहीं

एसे प्रवकाश का निबोधन करता है —

तत् लक्षणत्वात् – "यमथम्" परार्थ प्रयोजन युक्तित्वात्

अतल्लक्षणत्वे = प्रयोजन लक्षण रहितत्वे

संपाद्यत्वेन = साध्यत्वेन (शास्त्र का समपादन करना).

अभिसंहितम् = चित्तेऽनुसन्धान विषयी कृतम्

यत् मुख्यतया = प्रधानता से

प्रयोजकं = प्रेरकम् (कदाचिद् हि पुरुषस्य
फलार्थोऽपि संपाद्यत्वेनाभिसंहितः प्रयोजकस्य एव
भवति इति भावः)

अधिकृत्य = अधिकार विषयतां नीत्वा, आरभ्येति
यावत्

"इच्छन्" → इच्छा करता हुवा – यह शास्त्र बनाना
ही इच्छा का हेतु बना,

इच्छाविषयीकृतस्य = इच्छा में लाया हुवा कि परोपकार
भी हो

फलस्य = उपकारस्य

प्रवृत्तौ हेतुत्वं =
परोपकारेच्छैव ग्रंथकरणे
हेतुत्वा

शत्रा दर्शयति = शतृ प्रत्ययेन
शतृङ् प्रत्यय हेतु वाला भाव जतलाता है

प्रवृत्ती क्या है – परोपकार

नहिरपीच्छापूर्वैव सर्वा क्रियेति भावः

इच्छा शक्तिश्च उत्तरोत्तरम् = इच्छा शक्ति ही आगे
आगे

उच्छून स्वभावतया = ~~ज्ञान शक्ति के~~ सोजस मे
आकर

क्रियाशक्तिपर्यन्ता भवति = क्रिया शक्ति
बनती है।

उपशब्दस्य समीपार्थः कार शब्दस्य करणार्थः

तेन → इस उपकार से , तथा च दास इति पदवाच्यं
तादात्म्यम् उपकारार्थः
दास पद व्याख्यायां हि सर्वं देयत्वेन उक्तम्
सर्वं च परमार्थतः ऐक्यरूपं परमेश्वर तादात्म्यमे

परमेश्वर धर्मः = पूर्णत्व, सर्वज्ञत्वादयः

कारणम् = साधनम् (परमेश्वर के जो धर्म हैं
उन के समीप जाना).
(इस प्रत्यभिज्ञा शास्त्र का फल यही है) और
यही प्रयोजन भी है ॥

"अत स्वाह समस्त" इति → यतः उपकार पदस्य
परमेश्वर पूर्णत्वादि धर्म समीप करणमर्थः ततः
कारणात् इति अर्थः → आह "समस्त"

समस्ता = पूर्णत्वादिरूपा सर्वाः

परमेश्वरता लाभे = परमेश्वर लाभ जब प्राप्त हुवा

तत् निष्यन्दमय्यः संपन्ना = तो परमेश्वर धर्म
धर्म भी प्राप्त हुये

रोहो लाभे ~~र~~ रत्नसंपद इव =
जब सुमेरु लाभ प्राप्त हुए तो आप ही
सुमेरु रत्न लाभ भी प्राप्त हुवा ॥

प्रमुषितः = माया शक्ति वशेन विस्मृतिं गतः

स्वात्म परमार्थस्य = प्रकाशरूपः भावनिर्भरश्च
परमेश्वररूपः निजात्मैव

परमार्थः = उत्कृष्ट वस्तु यस्य तादृशः तस्य

अन्येन लब्धेन = अणिमादिक सिद्धयों के
प्राप्त होने से

लब्धः सः = स्वात्मरूपः परमार्थो येन तस्य

भक्ति = परमेश्वररूप स्वात्मविषया न तु अन्य देवता
विषया

समृद्धानां = जो ऐसी लक्ष्मी से निर्भर है

किम् अन्यत् = और कुछ

उपयाचितम् = अभिलाषी है

एनया → भक्त्या दरिद्राणां = रहितस्य

(समावेश संपदा समृद्धानां प्राप्तव्यस्य प्राप्तत्वात् नास्ति अन्यत्
उपयाचितव्यम्, भक्ति संपदा रहितानां तु परमार्थस्य
अनासादनात् किमन्येन असारप्रायेण इति अर्थः).

षष्ठी समासेन = तस्य - उसी को प्रत्यभिज्ञा प्राप्त
हो सकता है

↳ = समस्तसम्पत्समवाप्तेः
हेतुः तम इति एवं रूपेण

प्रयोजनम् = समस्त सम्पत्समवाप्ति रूपम्

बहुव्रीहिणा = इस समास से प्रत्यभिज्ञा उपाय
सूचित करता है॥

तथात्वेन — नीलसुखादि भावेन

प्रकाशः = भानम् (यथार्थ प्रकाश) एतेनास्य पदस्य प्रत्यभिज्ञा विशेषत्वं कथितम्

ननु कथं नीलसुखादि प्रमा प्रत्यभिज्ञाकारणम् इति आह-

अवाप्ति = अचल विमर्श की प्राप्ति
प्रमेय का प्रमा पर चढ़ना इस पर अचल विमर्श फिर प्रमाता पर चढ़ना*

तथाहि = ...

स्फुटतरं भासमानाः ये नीलसुखादयस्तेषां प्रमायाः
अन्वेषणेन — किंमूला इति विचारणेन, बाह्य प्रमा-

विचारे हि क्रियमाणे तन्मूलभूतस्य परप्रमातुः प्राप्तिरयत्नेन सिद्ध्यति घटान्वेषणेनेव सूद इति भावः

अन्यत्र = अन्य ग्रंथे

सोऽहमिति विमर्शः = पराहन्तापरामर्शः भवति।
सः कः?

इदमित्यस्य विच्छिन्नविमर्शस्य :- नीलसुखादि विषयायाः प्रमायाः

कृतार्थता = कृतकार्यतारूपा
निराकाङ्क्षात्मस्वात्मसातकारः ~~लोकस्~~

स्वस्वरूपे = परप्रमातरि, चिन्मये

विश्रान्तिः - लयः भवति

विच्छिन्नविमर्शस्य = विभिन्नप्रकाशाधीनसिद्धिकरणमिदं

इदमित्य = इदन्ता विमृशतस्य

NB प्रमाता हि नीलसुखादि स्वात्मनि लयीकरोत्येव, अन्यथा तृप्त्ययोगात्, तृप्तिरेव च प्रमायाः प्रमातरि विश्रान्तिः, स एव च परमातृलाभः

Read also Foot Note 42 on Page 18 I.P.V.

प्रकाशस्य = नील सुखादि प्रमायाः

सर्वापेक्षानिरोधतः = तृप्तिकृतायाः अपेक्षाभावरूपाय

NB Read Foot No 43 page 19 I.P.V.

इयता = समस्तसम्पत्समवाप्तेः प्रत्यभिज्ञाहेतुत्व कथनैः

उपाये = प्रत्यभिज्ञोपाये नहि नीलसुखादि प्रमान्वेषणं दुर्घटमिति भावः

सुकर = सरल   मार्गः = उपायः

तस्य = महेश्वरस्य

(It implies that it is not that the consciousness of self has never before been a fact of experience.)

(Shining as facing one self) प्रत्यभिज्ञा → प्रतीपम् आत्माभिमुख्येन ज्ञानं – प्रकाशः – प्रत्यभिज्ञा।

प्रति = प्रतीपम्   अभि = अभिमुख्यम्

ज्ञा = ज्ञानम् — तेन पूर्वं ज्ञातस्य मध्ये विस्मृतस्य पुनराभिमुख्येन ज्ञानं प्रत्यभिज्ञा इति

ज्ञातस्य मोहवशात् अज्ञातस्येव अभिमुख्येन हृदयंगमी ज्ञानं। अथा ज्ञातस्येव विस्मृतस्येव न तु स्मर्यमाणतया अपि तु स्फुटत्वेन ज्ञानं प्रत्यभिज्ञानं स एव अयं इति॥

प्रतीपम् इति —

स्वात्मावभासो हि = अपने स्वरूप का अवभासन

न तु अननुभूतपूर्वो = ऐसा नहीं कि पहिले नहीं अनुभव किया था – केवल अज्ञान से विस्मृतित् होकर भूला हुवा था॥

क्योंकि वह – अविच्छिन्न प्रकाश स्वरूप है, सतोदित है॥ (because it shines always)

स तु = यह आत्मा निश्चय से – सः = आत्मप्रकाशः

तच्छन्नतया = तत्संबन्धिन्या माया शक्त्या

(it appears as though cut off or limited) विच्छिन्न एव = भिन्न भिन्न जैसे (तेनैव कृतस्य तदवच्छेदस्य सत्यतयाऽवच्छेदत्वं नास्तीति)

तच्छन्नयैव – मायाशक्त्या स्वातन्त्र्यरूपया, ममायं स्वात्मअवभास इति मिततया विकल्पित इव वस्तुतः प्रकाश एव सदा स्फुरति॥

Recognition consists in unification of what appeared once with what appears now, as in the judgement "This is the same Chaitra".

प्रत्यभिज्ञा च → लौकिक व्यवहार में भी →

भात = जो पहिले से भात था – भासमान रूप = भासमान हो

अनुसंधानात्मिका = जैसे "चैत्र"

पूर्वं भातमद्य भासमानं तयोर्यदनुसन्धानम् – एकीकरण तदात्मा यस्याः तादृशी – स एव प्रतीयम इति प्रस पर्वापर विरोधो न शंकनीयः ॥

भात प्राक भासमानमिदानी एकीकरणं लोकप्रसिद्ध प्रत्यभिज्ञा च ।

प्रतिभिज्ञा च पूर्व दृष्टस्यैव चैत्रस्य इदानीं भासनमित्याशयः, तेन पूर्व दृष्टस्यैव चैत्रस्य वर्तमान काल भासनम्

अन्ततोऽपि = विशेषेण

सामान्यात्मना वा = सामान्य रूप से, कोप्ययमित्यनेन रूपेण

ज्ञातस्य → पूर्वम ज्ञातस्य पुनः = वर्तमान काले

प्रतिसंधित = सोयमिति एकीकरणीन,

प्राणितम् = सत्तायुक्तं कृतं

जैसे :—

नृपं प्रति = नृपे प्रत्यभिज्ञापितः = निवेदितः मन्त्रिभिरिति शेषः

अयं भावः – पूर्वं राज्ञा एतत्पुत्र एवंगुणक एवंरूपक इति विशेषेण वा, कोप्ययम् इति सामान्यात्मना वा ज्ञातः पुरुषो मध्ये विस्मृतः सन् पुनः राज्ञः समीपं गतस्तेन कोयमिति पृष्टस्तत्र मन्त्रिणस्तस्य राज्ञस्तद्विषयां प्रत्यभिज्ञामुत्पादयन्ति सोयमिति। ततो राज्ञः वोद्बुद्ध संस्कारः स्वयमपि प्रत्यभिजानाति सोयमिति ॥

अब न्याय से सिद्ध करता है :-

Having been got through ← विदित = ज्ञात किया हुवा, जाना हुवा

प्रसिद्ध ...... = प्रसिद्ध पुराणों, आगम शास्त्रो द्वारा अनुमानों से

पूर्ण... = पूर्ण शक्ति स्वरूप ~~का~~ ईश्वर का

सती = जब यह ज्ञान हुवा हो इन के द्वारा

स्वात्मन्यभिमुखी भूते = जब यही सन्मुख भात होता है, अपने ही आप में

तत्प्रतिसंधानेन = तत् स्मृत्या एकीकरणेन

ज्ञानम् = प्रत्यभिज्ञा उदेति = उदय होता है

नूने = निश्चये

Recognition arises through the unification of two experiences in the form of "Certainly I am that very Lord"

लोकेपि सोयमिति प्रत्यभिज्ञात इति, शास्त्रेपि गुरुणा ईश्वरोहमिति प्रत्यभिज्ञापित इति व्यवहार: संभवत्येव इति ॥

तामेनाम् = प्रत्यभिज्ञाम् स्वयम इति शेष:

उपपादयामि = सिद्ध ~~करना~~ करता हूं

→ उपपत्ति संभव: तां संभवन्तीं

तत्समर्थाचरणेन प्रयोजकव्यापारेण संपादयामि॥

तत्समर्थ = तस्मिन संभवे

समर्थाचरणम् = प्रेषणमिति, तेन प्रयोजक: — अहं उत्पलदेव:

प्रेषण = Commissioning

तस्य व्यापारेण = व्यापार भूतेन

संपादयामि = स्वव्यापारेण प्रेषणरूपेण तां संभवन्तीं — संपादयामि

तो सम्भवन्ती → "There is the potentiality of Recognition, because the Self is everything."

ननु कथं असौ संभवतीत्यात्राह — "तथाहि" इति

अविच्छिन्नप्रकाशत्वे चास्याः तद्रूपात्मविषयत्वेन ज्ञेयम् ॥

ननु यदि असौ संभवति तर्हि त्वं किं प्रवृत्त इत्यात्राह →

"निरोधक" = निरोधक अभिमता, आवृतिकारित्वेनाभिमत

समपसारणम् = दूरीकरणम्

(न हि वातेनापसारितमेघावरणः सूर्यस्तदुत्पादित इति कथ्यते इति भावः)

The active voice has been used in "उपपादयामि" because in the bringing about of Recognition, the distinction between oneself & others is absent.

प्रत्याभिज्ञोपपत्तौ = प्रत्याभिज्ञा की उत्पत्ती पर

स्वपरविभागाभावे = सर्वत्रैक्यदर्शनात्

कर्त्राभिप्रयादि = मुख्य कर्तुरिष्टत्वाद् इति

आदि शब्द और और शब्द जो आत्मने पद सूचित करते

असंभाव्यम् = संभावयितुमशक्यमित्यर्थः

इस लिए परस्मै पद "उपपादयामि" का प्रयोग किया है

परार्थी क्रिया पर परस्मैपद का प्रयोग किया जाता है ॥

"उपपादयाति" ~~पद~~ आत्मने

प्रयोजक व्यापारेण संपादयामि पद का प्रयोग नहीं किया है —.

I, through my Causal agency bring into play.

The following is the prose order of this Stanza:–

"Having Somehow got the union with the Highest Lord, which is the Cause of the attaining of all that is attainable and deserving the benefit of all ordinary mortals by helping them in getting union with the Highest Reality, which is the means of all attaining all that is attainable, through Somehow bringing about His Recognition, I establish His Recognition which is the means of attaining of all that is attainable."

In this word when it is used in the construction a second time, there is the causal affix (णिच्)

"प्रासाद्य" :- इस पद में — इति प्रावृत्तियोजने

(देहलीदीपन्यायेन युगपदुपकारत्वं त्वम्, सहभोजिनामेकपात्रन्यायेन क्रमेणोपकारकत्वम् आवृत्तित्वम्)

"आवृत्ति → कर्म से उपकार वाला भाव

इस पद से "आप भी प्राप्त करें, और साथ ही दूसरा भी प्राप्त करे" प्रतीत होता है।।

भरो न कृतः = वृत्तिकार ने प्रयत्न नहीं किया है।

what is obscure in aphorism in Vritti is intended to be briefly explained ← सवृत :- गूढतात्पर्यः यः सौत्रः निर्देशः तस्य यत् विवृतिमात्रम् - तात्पर्य प्रकटनमात्र तत्र व्यापारः यस्या वृत्तेः तादृश्याम्

The writer of the Tika also ← टीकाकारेण = उत्पलदेवः

being concerned with the exposition of Vriti only, has not touched this point. न स्पृष्टम = व्याख्यानस्य का कथेति भावः। तेषां बुद्धिरेव नात्र व्यापृतेति सूचितार्थः

इति विभज्य व्याख्यातम् = We have however explained it in detail because our attempt is to give full exposition of the aphorism. Does

अभिधेयं → Subject matter - नामक → प्रत्यभिज्ञा - उपायः

प्रयोजनं = उपायज्ञानं - प्रत्यभिज्ञा

~~तत्प्रयोजनं~~ तत्प्रयोजनं = प्रत्यभिज्ञान समवाप्तिः

तत्प्रयोजनं = परमैश्वर्यवाप्ति

सर्व सर्वत्र = this holds good everywhere अधिकारिनी = शक्तिपात पवित्र हृदये जनः

गुरुपर्वक्रमः संबन्धः — गुरुपरंपरासंप्रदायरूपः संबन्धः

अनेनास्योपदेशस्य महागुरुप्रसिद्धत्वमेव मूलत्वेन सूचितम्।।

तथाहि = आचार्येण कर्त्री

उपाया: — समस्तसंपत्समवाप्ति-हेतुः यस्यां सा तां इति बहुव्रीहिणा उक्तः नीलसुखादिसिद्धरूपः प्रत्यभिज्ञोपाय कर्म,

अभिधेयत्वेन = अयमेवेहाभिधेय इत्येवं भावेन

दर्शितः = साक्षात्कथितः

कया कृत्वा? पूर्वम् = संसारावस्थायाम्

संसारमूलकारणे पुण्यपापादौ हेतुः = हेतुभूतः

समस्तसंपल्लक्षणः = नीलसुखादि सर्वसंपत्स्वरूपः

योऽर्थो व्याख्यातः = समनन्तरं बहुव्रीहिमाश्रित्य प्रत्यभिज्ञोपायतया विवृतः

स एव प्रत्यभिज्ञायते = उपायभावेन जनविषये प्रत्यभिज्ञास्पदं प्राप्यते

एतया = अनेन शास्त्रेण करण०व्युत्पत्त्या = करणार्थ ष्ट्रन्साधनेन

संसारमूलकारणे = पुण्यपापादिहेतुभूते नीलसुखादौ एव यथोपायतो तद्विषयप्रमान्वेषणद्वारेण जनः प्रत्यभिजानाति, यो यः पुण्यपापहेतुत्वेन मम पूर्वं प्रसिद्धः नीलसुखादिभावः स एव मोक्षसाधनः इति

अतिदुर्घटकारित्वलक्षणम् = नवोपायीभूत नीलसुखादि मोक्षहेतुकथनरूप दुःखसंपाद्य वस्तुसंपादनरूपम्,

लोकोत्तरमार्गं प्रति = मोक्षं प्रति

उपायो निरूपितः = स एव कः इत्यपेक्षायामाह — "समस्त" इत्यादि "स एव" इत्यन्तम्। "हेतुः" इत्यन्तम्

देव = हे क्रीडनशील

क्रियानाम् अथवा विधीनां = विधीयों अथा क्रियाओंफल
(शाक्त, शांभव और आनव रूप उपायों द्वारा)

पर्यन्ततस्त्वन्मयतैव = तुम्हारे साथ तन्मैयता भाव ही है (अंशांशिक)

आपातेऽन्यफलत्वे अपि पर्यन्ते चित्तशोधनात् द्वारेण तन्मयैव फलम् इति अर्थः

ये पुनरत्र फलेप्सवो = ~~जो … मितसिद्धी रूप फ~~
= इस तरह से जो फल चाहने वाले हैं। (मित सिद्धियों का फल)

तेषां मूढा = वह मूढ जन।
अन्त में चित्त शुद्धि से अगर तन्मैयता भाव प्राप्त भी करते हैं।

स्थिति: स्यादनवस्थैव = लेकिन उन के इस तन्मैता भाव पर स्थिति दृढ नहीं रहती है॥

"तदत्र निरर्थत्यदम्" → तीसरी अध्याय का 16 श्लोक

"जनस्य" - इस पद से बतलाया है कि अधिकारी कौन है।

~~प्रत्यभिज्ञातव्य~~

प्रतिज्ञातव्य — प्रत्यभिज्ञातव्यम् = अस्मिन् शास्त्रे प्रत्यभिज्ञाविषयत्वेन अभिधेयम्॥

इदम् = व्याख्यातम् -

वाक्यम् = आद्यश्लोकरूपे

उद्देशरूपम् = नाममात्रेन

प्रतिज्ञादिपिण्डात्मके = प्रतिज्ञा गोलके

~~मध्य~~ ~~आद्य प्रकरण~~ श्लोक से प्रतिज्ञा

मध्यग्रन्थस्तु = ~~अ~~ ग्रन्थ का मध्य हेतु, उदाहरण, उपनयः और ~~निगमन्~~ अन्त के
~~अह~~ श्लोक से निगमन्

यह शास्त्र के ~~भ~~ पांच अवयव दिखलाये है

पञ्चावयवात्मकमिदं शास्त्रं = यह शास्त्र (प्रत्यभिज्ञा भी पांच अवयव रूप है)

परव्युत्पत्ति फलम = एतेनास्य शास्त्रस्य परार्थानुमानत्वं साधितम् ॥

Note · IVP page 25:–

परस्य व्युत्पादनमनुमानेन संभवति, अनुमानं च द्विविधं स्वार्थं परार्थं चेति, यत्र च स्वयमेव धूमादग्निमनुमाय परप्रतीत्यर्थं पञ्चावयवं वाक्यं प्रयुज्यते तत्परार्थानुमानम्, प्रतिज्ञाहेतूदाहरणउपनयननिगमनानि ~~च~~ पञ्चावयवाः, पर्वतायं वह्निमानिति प्रतिज्ञा, धूमवत्त्वाद् इति हेतुः, यो यो धूमवान् स स वह्निमान् व्याप्ति यथा महानस इति उदाहरणं तथा च अयम् इति उपनयः तस्मात्तथेति निगमनम् इति ॥

5 अवयवः:–
अनुमान के
(1) प्रतिज्ञा = पक्ष साधन – पर्वत में अग्नि है
(2) हेतुः = जिस से यह बात सही हो जाये
(3) उदाहारण = जहां जैसे नगर मे देखा है 'जहां धुआं है वहां अग्नि है (व्याप्ति)
(4) उपनय = "
(5) निगमनम्.

नैयायिक क्रमस्यैव = न ग्रंथकार ने नैयायिकों के क्रम को यानी अनुमान आदि से समझाना.

मायापदे परमार्थिकम् = ईश्वर सिद्धि सिद्धि माया पद केवल अनुमान आदि से ही ज्ञेय को समझाई जा सकती है

सुजनश्च = कोई सुजन पुरुष भी लौकिक व्यवहार में

लौकिक ईश्वर परिचित ईश्वर विषये जनम् = जब वह सुजन कोई नौकर ईश्व राजा के पास ले जाता है तो नौकर को सब कुछ ~~कि~~ राजा की विषय में बोलता है सब परिचय कराता है

"तस्य प्रत्यभिज्ञा" तस्य = जनस्य ईश्वर विषये प्रत्यभिज्ञा तस्य ईश्वरस्य च जनविषये प्रत्यभिज्ञा इति विग्रहार्थः -

ननु समस्तं प्रत्यभिज्ञा शास्त्रं श्रुत्वा जनस्य फललाभः स्यात् अथवा प्रथम श्लोक श्रवण काले ए "एतत" इति आह :-

एतत् श्लोक आकर्णी समये = आदि श्लोकस्य योऽर्थः तस्य श्रवन काले (प्रथम कक्षा).

संक्रमणक्रमेण = मनन् करने से (दूसरी कक्षा).

परमेश्वर तादात्म्य उपजायते = परमेश्वर का तादात्म्यभाव उपद्रुता है ॥ (तीसरी कक्षा).

At the time of hearing this Stanza, the identity of the pupils with the Ultimate takes place through understanding this shaloka.

शिष्याणाम् = इति अधिकार ग्रहणम्, अन्था कामणा रहितानां शिष्याणामपि तदापत्तेः, फलकामणाविष्टा एव हि फलोपायश्रवणकाले एव तत् लाभभाज इव तिष्ठन्ति न अन्ये ॥

तथाहि = तथा दृश्यताम् -

अधिकारिणि = फलकामनाविष्टे पुरुष विशेष

जनस्य इति आकरनात् = शब्द श्रवणेन -

इत्थमेव हि = इत्यैमेव प्रकारेण

शास्त्रार्थस्य = वक्ष्यमाणस्य शास्त्राभिधेयस्य

The meaning of the treatise is reflected on the consciousness of the deserving disciple as a reflection in the mirror

बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बवत् = बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बन्यायेन

संक्रान्तिः = मनसि स्फुर्तिः स्यात्

कस्मिन् सति?— लोट्लिङादीनां विषयीभवति= वाच्यतां गते,

प्रथमपुरुषार्थः = नास्मिन

उत्तमपुरुषार्थे = अस्मादि पर्यवस्यति=विश्रास्यति सति

Read note 57 to I.P.V. Page 26 :-

दुर्लभेश्वर

दुर्लभेश्वरदास्यासादनाद्वारेण जनस्य अयमुपकारमिच्छन् तत्प्रत्यभिज्ञामुपपादयति, इत्येवं भूतमर्थं प्रतिबिम्बकल्पं बिम्बस्थानीयात् उत्तमपुरुषार्थात्, प्रतिसंक्रमणवशात् आयातं अधिकारिरूपता संवेदनात् जनो यः कश्चित् स इह उपकार्यः — इत्येवंरूपात् स्वात्मनि उदितात् सदा अहं जन उपकार्यः, तत् दुर्लभेश्वरदास्यासादनौपायिकाम् अनेन उपपत्त्या स्थाप्यमानां प्रत्यभिज्ञाम् अहमपि उपपत्त्या हृदये स्थापयामि इति इयत्प्रतिपत्तिपर्यन्ता प्रतिपत्तिः॥

अस्तु अयमुपपादयति, = वयं प्राप्ता इति, एवम् इति अर्थः

आदि शब्देन लटो ग्रहणम्। परमार्थतः उपपादयामि इति श्लोके स्थितत्वेन शिष्यबुद्धौ स्फुरितस्य लटः प्रथमपुरुषस्य तत्रास्थितत्वात् चित् प्रयोगः

"प्रथमपुरुषार्थे" इति मध्यमपुरुषस्याप्युपलक्षणम् तस्यापि क्वचित् ~~प्रयो~~ प्रयोगे उत्तमपुरुषार्थे

पर्यवसानात् यथात्रैव लक्ष्यमाणे उदाहरणे, "सेवध्वम् सेवामहै" इति।

उ०

आरोग्यकामाः = वह सब जिन रोगरहित बनने की कामना है

शिवां = आमला सेवन्तां = सेवन करें इति लोटः

हरीतकीम्

सेवध्वम् = तुम सेवन करो प्रथमपुरुष प्रयोगयुक्तस्य

मध्यमपुरुषप्रयोगयुक्तस्य

सेवामहै → हम सब आमला सेवन करें

वाक्यार्थस्य = पदसमूहवाच्यस्य

सेवामहै इत्येवंरूपेण → उत्तमपुरुषे पर्यवसानरूपेण संक्रान्तौ द्वितीया कक्ष्या भवति

अधिकारिणी = आरोग्यकामनाविष्टे पुरुषविशेष

कीदृशे? तत्सेवनरूपां-तृतीयकक्ष्यामेव

भाविकोटिपतिताम् = चतुर्थकक्ष्यायां भाविनीम्

पुरुषार्थसम्पत्तिम् = आरोग्यसंपत्तिम्

स्वात्मीकृताम् = प्राप्ताम्

अभिमन्यमाने = वस्तुसौन्दर्यबलेन अभिमानविषयतां नयति।

केन? अकालकलितम् = कालास्पृष्टम्

यत्स्वरूपं = चिन्मात्राख्यं निजं स्वरूपं

तत्र अनुप्रवेशेन = स्वभावबलासिद्धेनावेशेन

पुनः कीदृशे? पूर्णताभिमानस्य यः प्रतिलाभः— "सेवामहै"

ततः, वितता — व्याप्तिं गता संविद् यस्य प्राप्तिः,

तादृशश्चासौ सुन्दरश्च परामर्शो यस्य तादृशे।

अतिकामनाविष्टो हि काम्योपायप्राप्तिसमय एव तृप्तो दृश्यते इति न कोऽपि विरोधः॥

नन्वु य एवं न संपद्यते तस्य का वार्तेत्याशङ्क्याह :-

"अन्य" इति

अनधिकारिता — अधिकारताया अभाव :

तदास्ताम् = अलम इति अर्थः

अवान्तरमेतत् = चूंकि उन को उदासीनता है और इस कारण उन को कोई लाभ नहीं।

अतिगहने च = बहुत मुश्किल भी है

इति स्थितमेतत् = सिद्धमित्यर्थः

ईश्वर सांमुख्यं = ईश्वर संमुखता भाव, ईश्वर-प्रत्यभिज्ञा

विनेयानां = ~~शिष्य~~ शिष्याणाम् ॥

I. Karika - page 5

(1) "Having somehow realised my identity with the Supreme and wishing to render service to humanity, I am establishing 'Self-Recognition' which is a means of attaining all that is of value."

In this System, Salutation means "Surrender" consisting in the dedication of body, speech etc. and mind exclusively to Him. A wise man ought to make that Surrender only if he realises the superiority of the object of his devotion to all others. Otherwise if he, unaware of any justification, bows to that which is not the Supreme, he would fall in the category of ordinary men, as has been said :-

"persons affected by limited knowledge and attachment, do not reach the Supreme Deity."

In so far as he is impelled by the limited powers of knowledge, will and action, which are the creation of Maya, he is still in bondage. But he might also be considered to be superior to others, because he has already passed some of the stages: as has been said by the illustrious Vidyāpati :-

P.T.O

"How can there arise the desire to praise any Boon-giver other than you, even through lower delusion, in him, who sees your glory unimpaired through the natural means of knowledge."

We shall deal with this topic in the Āgmakānda. Therefore, in any salutation a clear consciousness of superiority of the deity to others should be accepted as essential.

The All-inclusive Universal Consciousness is spontaneously realised by him, on whom the Higher Grace of God has fallen, and personal effort plays no part in it. For, all that being essentially a manifestation of Māyā, the principle of obscuration and, therefore, unilluminative like darkness, cannot be a means to the knowledge of the pure light, which is beyond Māyā and therefore, is the opposite of the manifestation. The pure light, as represented above, should however be clearly apprehended by calling to mind by some such word as "Jaite" which stands for all surpassing greatness,

P.T.O.

with a view to bringing it before one's own as well as other peoples' consciousness by means of inner visualisation and an outer expression respectively. Therefore when a word, expressive of salutation, is used the meaning of 'Jaite' should be considered to be implied in it. Even while uttering the word "Jaya", if a person does not surrender himself to Him, who is possessed of Supreme Greatness, and remains indifferent to Him, he does a great disservice to himself. Therefore, (when 'Jaya' is used) surrender, which is involved in the visualisation of Supreme Greatness, must be understood to be implied. Accordingly, when either 'Jaya' or 'Namaskara' is used, the other should be necessarily considered to be implied. The same thing holds good of "Vandana" "Namna", "Smarna" and 'Pradhyana' etc. because their real meaning is nothing more than the feeling of surrender, coupled with the visualisation of the Supremacy of the Supreme. Here, however, the author has adopted such a method that both these ideas are con-

P.T.O

veyed by means of direct expression. This will be made clear in the course of the explanation of the meaning of the words.

Reference by means of a conventional expression is reasonable, because it is good for all; indeed it goes straight, appeals to the heart of everybody; an implied meaning, on the other, (appeals) only to that of some, because all cannot get at the implied meaning, which the power of visualisation (Pratibhā) alone arouses. And consciousness of the word which is devoid of "meaning" is no consciousness at all. This will become clear in the sequel. With this idea in mind the author has followed this method of salutation, without the use of a well known words such as "Jaya" or "Namas" etc.

In this world whatever enters into consciousness is a mere manifestation of the Self, the Ultimate Reality to be defined later. Amongst the manifested, the casual relation, such as exists between the means & the end and so on is also real, because all this is a fact of consciousness, and the reality of what enters into consciousness cannot be denied. This what Bhaṭṭa Divākar has stated in

Contd on page 5

Vivekāñjana in the verses begining with :-

"The objects shine"

and ending in :-

"It does not cease to be a mere emphatic denial."

In the practical world, however this causal relation often appears to be indirect because of the appearance of the limited Self, due to the multiplicity of the manifested, which is essentially the infinite group of powers, characterised which are invariably within the Supreme Creative power, characterised by perfect will. That indirect Causality will be proved to be a manifestation of Māyā. It is of innumerable kinds, due to innumerable subdivisions of the sentient and the insentient. It is this which is responsible for the relation between the Creator and the Created and the object and the means of knowledge as we perceive in ordinary life.

Where, however, the unlimited light of Self, possessed of All-Transcending power which is nothing but the essential nature of the pure Self, is the Cause, and there is no intervention of the limited Self, a manifestation of Māyā, there the Causality is conceived to be that of the Supreme.

P.T.O

This is called "Grace", the fifth and the last act of the Supreme power, which leads to the attainment of the highest human goal. For, perfect freedom is due to that alone. As for the liberation taught by other systems, it will be said later that it is partial and not complete and therefore an illusory one. The Grace is another causal-relation: the Grace, which cannot be clearly conceived, because it is different from the well-known causal-relation, established by invariable concomitance and logical discontinuance in ordinary life; the Grace, the essential nature of which is revealed by the liberation, which sometimes occurs; the miraculous nature of which is due to the operation of the Supreme Creative-power characterised by the bringing about of the impossible, and which cannot be attained by merely hundreds of longings for the removal of the beginningless dark veil, which hides the true nature of the Self. And it (the Grace) is referred to as such by the word "कथं" together with the suggestive particle "चित्". The word कथंचित् means "somehow" by devotion, which is inspired by the Lord Himself, to the teacher who has identified.

Contd on page 8.

himself with the Lord, as has been said:—

"The union is very difficult to attain."

In the word "आसाद्य", 'आ' means "from all sides" i.e. "completely" and sādayitva (sādya) means "having made it fully fit for realisation" by one's own self. Thus, because of his having known the knowledgeable, his competence to present the system for others is shown. Otherwise, he would have been a mere deceiver. By means of the past time (which is expressed by 'lyap') immediate sequence is intended to be implied here. Otherwise the highest stage of identification having been reached and the affections of impurities of Māyā having been destroyed, how could there remain the possibility of imparting instructions to others?

There do exist powerful deities within the sphere of Māyā, such as Vishnu, Virincha etc. Further, there are beings partly pure, namely Mantrā, Mantresā, Mantra Maheśa, who are within the sphere of MahāMāyā, beyond the Māyā, and finally, there are pure beings Sadāśiva etc. but Maheshvara is the Glorious One, by the sparks of Whose power they have attained

P.T.O

Godhead, and whose essential nature is perfect freedom, consisting in unbroken Self-luminosity and Self-consciousness (Anandā). By speaking of identity with 'Him', the author indicates the establishing of His Recognition. is of very great importance. The word 'Dasya' means a state of the 'devotee' to whom the Lord gives all that is desired. By means of this word the author represents himself to be the recipient of the perfect power of will, which is not different from the Highest Lord Him himself. The word 'Janase' means 'of whatever that is born'. Thus, he means to point out that there is no restriction of any kind in regard to the right to follow this system. Whosoever realises the true nature of the Self, attains the highest goal, because Self-realisation is the highest goal and that cannot be impeded by anything which is regarded as an impediment. For, whatever is realised is realised. It has been said:-

"Here no beginning is futile, nor is there any impediment. Even a little of this spiritual attainment saves a man from great fear".

My great-grand-teacher also has said in his Shivdsti :-
" Once one gets the unshakable knowledge of the Omnipresence of Shiva, through the means of right knowledge, scripture or preceptorial instruction, the instruments of knowledge and meditation, become perfectly useless. For, once gold is known as such, are the instruments necessary to reveal its genuineness? At all times, the certainty is due to a firm belief, as in the case of one's own parents. etc."

The word 'जनस्य' means one who is constantly troubled by birth & deaths. By this word, he declares the transmigrating souls to be deserving of help, because of their being objects of compassion. The word 'ऽपि' indicates his identity with the Supreme and precludes the possibility of any other motive in him than the good of others; because he has attained perfection. The good of others is also really a motive, because the definition of motive applies to it. There is no devine curse that only one's own good can become a motive & not that of others. Even one's own good, if it does not come within

P.T.O.

the definition, is not a motive at all. That which is fixed upon as the main object of attainment and, therefore, urges one on to action, is motive (प्रयोजनः). Hence the founder of Nyaya System in order to show that, even according to dualism, the motive of God, in creating the world etc is good of others, has defined motive as follows:—

"Motive is that, aiming at which man acts"

By means of the present participial affix (Śatṛ) in "उद्दिशन्" he points out that the object aimed at is the cause of action. We shall show that the will-power as it gradually grows, developes in to the power of action. The word "Upa" means near. Therefore the aim here is to bring the ordinary mortal nearer to the State of Highest Reality. Therefore, it is that he used the word, "all" (समस्त). Once the State of Highest Reality is reached, all attainable things, which merely flow from it are automatically attained, just as all the gems are, when

Contd on page 11

when the mountain of gems called "Rohana" is acquired. To one who has missed the Highest-Reality, namely the Self, other attainments are useless; by one who has attained the Highest Reality there is nothing else to be desired. As the Author himself has stated:-

"Those who are rich in the wealth of devotion have nothing left to be desired. To those who are poor in it, what is the use of a quest for other things."

Thus by taking "Samasta" etc, as a genetive compound, the purpose has been stated: but by taking it as an attributive compound, the means is indicated:- "That Recognition of the ultimate, in which (yasyam) the clear consciousness (Samavapti) of the essential nature (Sampat) of the external and internal objects, both existing & non-existing, such as 'blue' and 'pleasure' etc (Samasta) is the cause (हेतु). Indeed, it is taught in this system that the attainment of the true Self is possible only through an investigation of the ultimate source of knowledge of 'blue' and

P.T.O.

"pleasure" etc., which so distinctly affect the Consciousness. As has been stated elsewhere:-

"The ultimate end of all objective Consciousness, "this" is its merging in the Self. The Consciousness 'I am that' stands for it."

In this context it is further stated:-

"Aham bhāva has been declared to be the merging of object in the Subject. The same is called the rest (विश्रान्ति), the perfect freedom, the supreme causal agency and supreme creative power, because it involves the disappearance of all desires."

"By this, all apprehension that the means is difficult to adopt, has been set aside. We will state at the end of the work:-

"This present path is smooth".

"तस्य" means of 'Maheshwara'. Recognition means shining (Jña-jñāna) as facing once self (प्राभिमुख्येन) of what was forgotten. 'प्रतीपम्' emphasises that it is not the consciousness of the Self has never before been a fact of experience, because it always shines, but that, as will be explained later, through His own power, it

Contd on Page 13.

appears as though cut off; or limited.

Recognition consists in the unification of what appeared once with what appears now, as in the judgement "This is the same Chaitra". It is a recognition, which refers to an object, which is directly present. It is reached through unification of experiences. In ordinary life, in such statements as "So & So has been made to be recognised by the King" recognition means cognition, consisting in unification of experiences at the time of subsequent apprehension of one who was known before, either in general terms or in particular, as the son of So & So, of such & such description and qualities. In the present context also the knowledge of the Lord as possessed of supreme power, having been got through the well known puranas, Siddhanta, Agama and inference etc; and the immediate apprehension of one's own Self being always there, recognition arises through the unification of two experiences in the form: "Certainly I am that very Lord". "I shall establish that Recognition". In "upapadayami"

P.T.O.

the root with ~~affix~~ prefix (upapad-upapatti) means potential existence. The Causal affix means that potentiality being there, I, through my Causal agency, bring into play. Indeed, there is the potentiality of recognition, because the Self is ever shining. Bringing about is no more than the removal of the influence of Māyā, which is considered to be a force of observation. The active voice has been used in "upapadyāmi", because in the bringing about of recognition, the distinction between oneself & others being absent (in the agent), there is no possibility of the agent's being affected by any purpose etc.

The following is the prose-order of this ~~Stanza~~ Stanza :—

"Having somehow got union with the Highest, which is the Cause of the attainment of all ~~that is~~ attainable, and desiring with the benefit of ordinary mortals by helping them in getting union with the Highest Reality, which is the means of attaining all that is attainable, through somehow bringing about His Recognition, I establish His Recognition which is the means of attaining of all that is attainable."

Contd on page 15.

15

In the word "आसाद्य" when it is used in the construction a second time, there are two causal affixes (nich).

The writer of the Vritti has not taken the trouble of giving such a detailed explanation, because his object was simply to state the implication. This is what has been said:-

"(In Vritti) which is intended to explain briefly what is obscure in the aphorisms."

The writer of the Tīkā also, being concerned with the exposition of the Vritti only, has not touched this point. We have, however, explained it in detail, because our attempt is to give a full exposition of the aphorism. This holds good everywhere. Thus in this verse, the subject matter, the object, its object, the object of the matter, the statement of the qualification of the person, for whom this system is meant, the preceptorial line and the relation are shown. By dissolving the compound as an instrumental attributive, the means to a spiritual path has been determined. The objective world (represented by 'blue', 'pleasure' etc) constitutes the entire possession and is at first the cause of sin and merit etc, the root-cause of transmigration.

P.T.O.

By this Shastra the same is made to be recognised as the sure means to essential path.
Thus, the author who, at the end of the work, refers to his power of accomplishing what is difficult by the words "new path", has indicated that the statement of means is the subject matter of the work. That is why he will begin another stanza with the words:-

"Thus, of the insentient".

The object is the knowledge of the means of recognition; the object of the object is the recognition itself; the object of the latter is the exclusive conscious of ultimate Reality, which is all that is attainable. There is nothing beyond it, because even a fraction of it is the ultimate goal of all goals. This is what I have myself said in a Stotra:-

"O Lord! the ultimate aim of all worldly or religious acts is the identification with you. Those who seek some other end in this unification also will ever remain in a state of ignorance!"

He will himself say later on in a hemistich

"Therefore, setting foot on that!"

Contd on page 17

This is the Substance of the work.

Just as a good man, familiar with the Lord of the land, brings about the approach of an ordinary mortal, endowed with the qualities of a Servant to the lord and reveals the lord as possessed of the group of qualities such as approachability to the ordinary mortal: So the author, who has realised the Supreme, being a good man brings about the recognition of the Supreme by the ordinary man. This much meaning is conveyed by the dissolution of "तत् प्रत्यभिज्ञा" as the genitive determinative Compound "His Recognition".

At the time of hearing this Stanza the identity of the pupils with the Ultimate takes place through understanding of this Sholoka. That is as follows:- on hearing the word "of the ordinary mortal (जनस्य)" the meaning of the treatise on the System is reflected in the Consciousness of the deserving disciples as a reflection on the mirror;

Contd on Page 19.

By the word "of the ordinary mortals' (जनस्य) the person for whom the system is meant, is indicated, as he will say in the conclusion:-

"Always concentrating on this".

By the word "Somehow" (कथंचित्) the preceptorial line is shown; as he will say:-

"As the great teacher has said in his work Shivdrishti:-"

This stanza, because it puts together all that is to be said about 'recognition' is a summary statement of the subject matter and authorial undertaking. The mid-portion of the work states the reasons etc, and the last verse:-

" Thus I have shown" etc

is the conclusion. Thus, this work, which presents the subject matter in a syllogistic form including five terms has the ... the instruction of others as its object. The idea of the author that in the creations of Māyā, the point of view of the Naiyāyika is the right one, will become clear in such statement as "Action, relation and Generality."

This

P.T.O.

not when he takes it indifferently, but when the third person of the various tenses 'लोट्' 'लिङ्' etc appeals to him as the first person, as follows:–

"We are the persons, who are troubled by birth and death and have various kinds of attachments. This teacher, desiring our benefit having realised his identity with the Supreme establishes His Recognition, which is the means of attaining all that is attainable and therefore, we have as good as attained His Recognition of the above nature".

Otherwise there would be no difference between the meanings understood the deserving and the undeserving.

When the meaning of the sentence, "persons desiring health, should use the yellow myrobalan" or "you should use the yellow myrobalan" appears in the consciousness of the deserving as "Let us use it", that is the 2nd stage.

But the second stage will be reached only by him, who imagines himself to be free from the limitations of time, as he usually is

P.T.O.

who believes that the third stage, namely, the use of the yellow myrobalan, is the attainment of the end, which is really reached only in the fourth stage, or whose knowledge is free from all limitations and therefore, beautiful because of his having realised perfection within himself. Others are undeserving, because they are really indifferent, and therefore are not of this nature. This will suffice, because it is a digression & rather abstruse. Thus the point is established. By means of this Shaloka, the approach of the disciples to the Lord is brought about, and the object etc are stated (1)

अनन्तभाव संभारभासने स्पन्दनं परम् ।
उपोद्घातायते यस्य स्तुमः संविदा शिवम् ॥

वयं तं शिवम् — प्रकाशस्वभावं सर्वानन्दकारिणम्

स्तुमः — सर्वोत्कृष्टतया भावयामः

तं कम् ? अनन्त = अपरिच्छिन्नः, यो भावसंभारः = स्वान्तर्निमग्नः पदार्थसमूहः

भासने = अहमिति स्वान्तः प्रदेशात् इदमिति तस्य बहिरवभासने

यस्य परम स्पन्दम् = स्वरूपात् किंचित् चलन रूपः अहमिति सामान्यस्पन्दः

उपोद्घातायते = Introducing, beginning.

उप = समीपे तदादावेव हन्यते = टंक्यते दीनारे इव राजनामात्र शास्त्राभिधेयम् इति उपोद्घातः

भाविनः पदार्थसमूहस्य सामान्यस्पन्दे एव प्रथमं स्थितत्वात्, अन्यथा निर्भासंभवप्रसंगात् ॥

भूमिका

1

Page 28 : Kārikā - No 2

" We always praise that Śiva, whose initial Creative Stir (param spandanam) is the beginning of the manifestation of the innumerable variety of objects."

Well; first of all, Iśvara has to be proved.

What is meant by proving (Siddhi)? It cannot mean 'bringing into being', because He is eternal. Even those who prove the existence of the Supreme do not bring Him into being. But if you mean by the word "proving", revealing, it is of no use in the case of Him who is of unlimited light, because proving consists the throwing light by means of right Knowledge.

How do you know that His light is unlimited? For, we do not see His light in ordinary objects like 'blue' & pleasure. Still less we do so in deep sleep & unconsciousness, where the worldly objects do not appear at all. Even if the Supreme be Self-Shining, why is it that the Cognitive activity of the Subject

P-T-O.

in reference to Him is useless? With this objection in mind the Author says:-

(i) "Which sentient being can prove or disprove the Supreme Lord, who is essentially Omnipotent, Omniscient and eternal."

The universe being merely His manifestation, who, by what means of knowledge, regarding what kind of Lord can and advance a proof or disproof, leading to the knowledge of His being or not-being? If you say "the subject" "What is that? Is it the insentient body etc. or something different from them, called by some such word as 'Self'? And is that too essentially self-shining or not? If it be insentient body etc., how can that not being self-shining, make something else shine? The self also, if it be not self-shining, would naturally be insentient and therefore no better than the former. If it be essentially self-shining (the question will arise) "What is the essential nature of its self-shining?" If it shines merely in the form of unchanging pure consciousness, then the differentiation of cognitions and the putting together of the different

Contd from 2.

differentiated by internal unification, will not be possible. Therefore it has to be admitted that it Shines as free Self-Shining entity. Shining as Such, what kind of Lord will it prove and disprove? If it be one that Knows and acts, i.e. possesses the powers of Knowledge and action, the Subject itself being Such, how is the Lord different from it? It cannot be argued that the Subject is neither Omniscient nor Omnipotent, because the meaning of the word "Omni" (सर्व:) does not imply any difference in the essential nature of the powers of action & Knowledge. For even, according to dualistic System, the Knowledge, desire & action of the Lord being eternal, are not affected i.e. added to in any way by the objects, which are not their Causes. If it be said that the objectivity of an object consists in being made to Shine (by the Subject), we will reply that what is essentially not light cannot be made to Shine. But if the object be held to be of the nature of light, then it is light in every way. Thus the ultimate truth being that the light Shines, what would be the essential distinction

P.T.O.

between all-knowing & one who knows little. The same question as to whether it is self-shining or not may be raised in regard to the means of right knowledge and in the case of proving (प्रमिति:) is itself also. Therefore assuming the form of what is ordinarily known as the object, the Self shines itself shining, free from all limitation. It shines even to one who is in deep sleep (i) because otherwise, the remembrance of it would be impossible (ii) because the light is eternal as there is nothing to limit it: and (iii) because it shines to other subjects. As for the difference of subjects from one another which is due to prakāsha itself, it will be represented to be manifestation of Māyā.

He (The Lord) is free. And it will be explained that His Freedom is manifold and consisting in bringing about diversity in unity and unity in diversity by internal unification. The word Kartare (कर्तरि) has been put first, because this represents His omni potential ultimate nature

Contd on Page 5

5

which consists in 'Ānandā', "Freedom"; To point out an aspect of that very freedom the word 'ज्ञातर' has been used later. It will be explained later that action is essentially an offshoot of knowledge. Therefore the words 'कर्तर' and 'ज्ञातर' in the text mean the same thing as "the one who is perfectly free in all actions, and is omnipotent". This very freedom constitutes the essential nature of consciousness (Samvid). It will be stated later that if it be referred to by the word "Samvit", then that word means that it is an object of determinate knowledge and, therefore, objective & created and as such it is not the ultimate Reality. The use of nominative "Karta" "Gnaata" 'कर्ता' & 'ज्ञाता' and 'Maheshvara' would involve the same difficulty. Therefore, an effort has to be made as far as possible to avoid the taint of degradation consisting in bringing it down to the state of objectivity. Therefore, reference has been made in a case, expressive of an accomplished state:

P.T.O.

because, at the time of instruction, it is impossible to avoid objectivity in every way.

By the word 'स्वात्मनि' which means 'in his own unchanging nature', there is refutation of the insentient Self, accepted by the Vishesikas etc. "अपारचितेः" means 'of the unlimited light'. The Supreme Creative power implied by the word 'महेश्वरे' consists in manifesting one-self as omniscient & omnipotent on account of having unlimited light. The word 'अजडात्मा' implies "Let the Vaisheshikas etc according to whom Self is really insentient, try to prove the Lord. And let the Sankhyas disprove Him. For, the Sankhyas also in holding the Cognition (ज्ञाना:) the nature of which is to illumine objects, to be a quality of the Budhi, really declare the Self to be eisentient. And an insentient Self which can hardly shine itself independently, cannot, like a stone, prove or disprove anything" Nor can one, according to whom the Self is sentient, do this. For, how would he, being an अजडात्मकत्वादिति prove, the Self. The reason implied stated

Contd on P. 7

as follows:-

If the Self, as conceived by him, appears to him as new, it would mean that it did not shine before, but if it did not shine before it comes to be insentient. And how would he, being an अज्ञातात्मवादिन्, disprove? For, if it does not shine, it is insentient and it has already been said that neither the insentient nor the sentient can do it ((i.e. prove or disprove Maheshvara). Therefore, the light of external object is non-different from the light of Self. It has no truly independent existence. And the Self is nothing but light. Therefore, just as there is no activity of a causal agent in relation to Maheshvara, so there is neither that of means of right knowledge; because He is eternal & Self-shining (1)

"ननु" इति पूर्वपक्षवादि प्रश्ने ।

कर्तव्या = अवश्यकरणीया

ईश्वरस्य सिद्धिरवे = ईश्वर की सिद्धि ही प्रथमम् करनी आवश्यक है

दास्य-भाव यदि प्राप्त भी हुवा आप को ईश्वर का, आरम्भ में पहिले उस की (ईश्वर की सिद्धि कीजिए)॥ होती है वह सिद्धि॥

"कैयम सिद्धि" — कौन सी और किस की सिद्धि, और क्या

It cannot mean 'bringing into being'. ← न तावत उत्पत्तिः — नित्यत्वात (because it is eternal) = जो नित्य हो उस की उत्पत्ति का प्रश्न ही कहां उठता है। जो आदि-सिद्ध हो उस को सिद्ध क्या करना है।

नापि → उत्पत्तिरूप सिद्धिं नाशयितुमाह —

ईश्वरसिद्धिकारादयः = ईश्वर को तर्क आदि से सिद्ध करने वाले तर्कवादिनः

तस्य उत्पत्तिं विदधते = वह भी उस की उत्पत्ति की बात नहीं करते

(यहां ग्रंथकार दो तरह की लोकप्रसिद्ध सिद्धिः का निर्णय करता। (१) उत्पत्ति सिद्धि (२) ज्ञप्तिः सिद्धि — ज्ञान द्वारा किसी चीज़ को सिद्ध करना).

If you mean by 'proving', its revealing it is of no use — ← ज्ञप्तिः सिद्धिरिति चेत् = अगर तुम यह कहो कि ईश्वर की सिद्धि ज्ञान द्वारा होसकती है॥

because it is unlimited light & always there. ← अनवच्छिन्नप्रकाशस्य = स्वप्रकाशत्वेन सततमवभासमानस्य नित्यप्रकाशरूपस्य च, अर्थात् ईश्वरस्य.

It means through light by means of right knowledge ← प्रमाणव्यापारोपाधेयः = प्रमाणव्यापारसाध्यत्वेन तदवच्छेद्यो यः प्रकाशः — ज्ञप्तिः, प्रमाणव्यापार से ग्रहण करनी

— प्रकाशात्मक सिद्धि = तदात्मिका या सिद्धिः तस्या अनुपयोग एव भवति। न हि सूर्यस्य प्रकाशे

दीपापेक्षा न युक्येति भाव: ॥

ननु अनवच्छिन्नस्तदीय: प्रकाश इति कथमेतत् - तदी प्रकाशस्य-
अनवच्छिन्नप्रकाशत्वं न युज्यते इत्यर्थ: : एतदेव
समर्थयितुमाह :-

नीलसुखादि प्रकाशे हि = नहिनीलज्ञानमेव
तत् प्रकाशः कुतः - ईश्वर ज्ञानम् न भवतीत्यर्थ: -
तदप्रकाशेऽपि = (नील प्रकाश रूप ईश्वर स्वरूप नही हो सकता)
तर्हि नीलाथकाशे तत्प्रकाशोऽस्त्वित्यत्राह-
तत् = नितरां (— अतिशयेन नास्तीत्यर्थ:, अनवच्छिन्न-
प्रकाशत्वम् भ्युपगम्यपि प्रमाणव्यापारानुपयोगं
प्रत्याह :-

सुप्तमूर्छादौ = सु नींद या मूर्छा की अवस्था में तो
नील ज्ञान नही होता है

"स्वप्रकाशे" इति → अनवच्छिन्नप्रशत्व साधक-
प्रकाशत्व युक्ते =

प्रमातॄणाम् = ईश्वर प्रमातॄणाम् किं वृत्तम् =
~~कि~~ सम्पन्नम्
(वृत्तं = क्रियाशीलता का कारण, सत्ता, व्यहार

भाव यह है कि जिन्हों ने ईश्वर-ज्ञान ~~प्रमित~~ प्राप्ति
मे प्रमातॄं को प्रमाणव्यवहार ~~में और~~ अनुपयोग्य
होने से उन की स्वयम गती कैसी है (what change
comes in them as a consequence of which
~~they don't require~~ शक्ति सिद्धि method). because
useless in reference to Him).

[Marginal notes:]
How do you know His light is un-limited?
For we do not see His light in ordinary objects
Much less do we see so in deep sleep or unconsciousness.
Even if the Supreme be self-shining, what is it that the cognitive activity of the subject in reference to S. Him is useless

कर्तरि ज्ञातरि स्वात्मन्यादिसिद्धे महेश्वरे ।
अजडात्मा निषेधं वा सिद्धिं वा विदधीत कः ॥२॥

योजना :- कर्तरि ज्ञातरि आदिसिद्धे (पूर्वसिद्धे) महेश्वरे (स्वातन्त्र्ययुक्ते) आत्मनि सति, अजडात्मा (चेतनः, अनात्मवादी वा, वैशेषिकादेः सांख्यादेः बौद्धादेः जडः आत्मा, तान विहाय) कः निषेधं वा सिद्धिं वा विदधीत (कुर्यात्) ॥

When Atma (Self) is already a fact of everybody's experience, as possessing powers of action & cognition and having freedom to use his powers, which sensible person (other than a Baudha, Vaisheshika and Sankhya, according to whom Atma is not sentient) would deny or establish the existence of such a being.

Bouddhas say there is no Atma. Vaisheshikas say: Atma knows but does not act (existing etc.). Sankhyas say cognition is a function of Magic Buddhi and so Atma neither knows nor acts & so by inference they too do not believe in Atma. So all these are ajadatma: not living as they have no (in being) Atma nor jad as the jude.

कर्तरि = कर्तृता स्वभाव सहित   ज्ञातरि = ज्ञातृता स्वभाव सहित
स्वात्मा = आत्मा (स्वात्म्य - जो स्वतः)
महेश्वरे = जो महेश्वर स्वरूप है - स्वातन्त्र्ययुक्त
आदिसिद्धे = स्वतः सिद्ध (घटादि सिद्धिः प्रमाणाधीना तादृशी सिद्धिरस्य नास्ति इत्यतः आदिसिद्धः)
अजडात्मा = वह कौन सा चैतन्य प्रमाता है पुरुष है
सिद्धिं वा निषेधं वा = ईश्वर की सिद्धिः या उस की

की सत्ता को (existence) निषेध करे (ज्ञप्ति रूप से या उत्पत्ति रूप से).

अजडात्मा = चैतन्यवान प्रमेयत्वोभ्युपगमात् परोहीति पर बौद्ध नैयायकादिकाः ॥

इह = ईश्वराधीनसिद्धिके जगति   कः = तदन्तर्गतः को भावः

कीदृशो ईश्वरे = किंगुणे ईश्वरे

कीदृशेन प्रमाणेन = कैसे जैसे प्रमाण से (प्रकाश०व्यवहार रूपो)

- ज्ञानलक्षणां सिद्धि = ज्ञान रूपा - ज्ञप्ति रूपं
ऐसी कोई भी ज्ञप्ति रूप युक्ती नहीं है जिस से उस की सिद्धि हो या उसे निषेध करसके

सम्योजनादौ

If you say "the subject" प्रमाता इति चेत — प्रमाता = नीलसुखादिषु- सम्योजना वियोजना स्वातन्त्र्य देहादि

what is that? स एव कः? → गुरुरत्र शिष्यं प्रति प्रश्नयति - किं शब्दस्यार्थं विभज्य दर्शयति "देहादि" इति -
वह क्या है देह है, बुद्धि है या प्राणादि है - क्या चीज़ है वह प्रमाता ॥ यह सभी तो जड है

स्वात्मनि / अभिषिच्य॥

उत = या कि   तदन्यो → देहादेरन्यः चिन्मात्ररूपः

आत्मादि शब्दवाच्यः - जो आत्मा या ईश्वर शब्द से वाच्य है

सोऽपि = तदन्योऽपि, आत्मादि ~~आदि~~ स्वप्रकाश स्वभावो वा
न वा = स्वप्रकाश स्वभावो अप्रकाशस्वभावो वा
देहादि जडः इति चेत् = अगर कहो वह भी देहादि की
भांती जड है ॥

स एव = ~~देहाद~~ देहादिरेव
स्वात्मनि असिद्धः —
} ~~स~~ च
अप्रकाश प्रमेयवत् जड एव
स्वयं प्रकाश असमर्थत्वात्

परत्र किं सिद्धिं कुर्यात् = जो आप अप्रकाश ही जड हो
वह दूसरे को क्या प्रकाश दे सकता है
जडरूप दूसरे चीज को क्या सिद्धी दे-
सकता है ॥

देह, बुद्धी, प्राणादि यह तो सभी जड हैं ईश्वर की सिद्धिः
पर कैसे समर्थ हो सकते हैं ॥

परत्र = स्वव्यतिरिक्ते ईश्वरे

If the self also be not-self-shining then that is insentient. ← आत्मापि अस्वप्रकाशो = अगर यह आत्मा स्वप्रकाश
नही है तो यह देहादि जैसे जड ही है।

तुल्य तत्तुल्ययोगक्षेमः = तो यह भी उसी के बराबर
अप्राप्य शुभस्य लब्धिः ~~स~~ है।
योगः, तद्रक्षा क्षेमः,
तौ यस्य सः ॥

If it be self-shining, naturally the question will arise "what is the essential nature of this its self-shining: if it shines merely in the form of unchanging pure consciousness, then the different kinds of cognitions standing together of the different kinds by internal unification will not be possible. ← स्वप्रकाश स्वभावः इति चेत् = अगर ऐसा कहो कि
स्वयं यह प्रकाशमान है और दूसरे
वस्तुओं को भी प्रकाशित करते हैं॥
(जैसे ~~वेत~~ वेदान्तिन् कहते है) लिकिन् कर्तृता
रहित है).

कीदृशेन स्वेन रूपेण आभाति? = स्वं प्रति स्फुरति
(स्वातन्त्र्य वैकल्येन वा तद्वैपरीत्येन, इत्याशयः
स्वप्रकाशपदस्यैवार्थमाक्षिप्याह ॥) (6)

परिनिष्ठित संविन्मात्ररूपेण, → प्रान्तत्वेन स्वरूपमात्रे स्थितं यत्संविन्मात्रं तदेव रूपं तेन,
संकुचितं स्वात्मविमर्श हीनमुक्तमकतृता रहितम्
मात्र ग्रहणेन अत्यन्त संकुचितत्वं लक्ष्यते।
ज्ञानमात्ररूपेण, भाति प्रान्तत्वेन स्वरूपमात्रे स्थितत्वम्॥

तदा संविदां भेदनं = संविद् (ज्ञान के) जो भेद हैं
जैसे इदं घटा, इदं पटा
(विषयकालेऽनुभवात्मके बहिरवभासमानानां नीलादिनां॥).
अथवा विषयग्रहेण काले विभागं कृत्वा ऽन्योऽन्यतः भेदेन भासनम् — यह जो अलग अलग ज्ञान है।
भेदितानां च = इन अलग अलग ज्ञानों को
परस्परानुसंधानेन अभेदनं न स्यात्:
स्मृति समये एकीकरणम् न स्यात्॥
अन्यथा स्मृत्यसंभव प्रसंगात्, स्मर्ता हि स्मृति-काले नीलादि विषयं ~~एकीकरणम्~~ पूर्वापरं ज्ञानद्वयम् एकविषयताकरणेनैकीकरोत्येव - तदेव स्मरणमुच्यते।
प्रान्तत्वे च भेदनाभेदने असंभवोपहत एव॥

तेन = यतः पूर्वोक्तम् न युज्यते तत इत्यर्थः, -
स्वतन्त्रः = संविदां भेदनाभेदनयोः समर्थः (विमर्श सहितेन).
स = आत्मा।
(which all is) ~~भासते = स्वतन्त्र्येन प्र~~

If he is only knowledge and cannot do anything then differentiation between various objects cannot be done by him as it is doing. that is understanding them dividing one and then carrying their accumulation into unity and there bringing them only. Therefore it has to be admitted that it shines as free-self-shining entity.

(action) will not be possible to be done by such time or god unmoved light - He will be just a lamp standing lamp. So he won't be independent at all.

So we prove a funny God incapable of action!

तथा भासमानश्च = स्वतन्त्र प्रकाश भावेन

कीदृशमीश्वरं साधयेत निषेधेत वा? = ऐसे स्वातन्त्र्य सहित ईश्वर को जो स्वप्रकाश स्वभाव हो कैसे कोई सिद्ध कर सकता है या निषेध कर सकता है —

So he can know & do. This is his qualification

तथाभूत: → कर्तृ ज्ञातृ स्वभाव:

And so when such a God who knows & acts is established. He is the Subject. The subject cannot prove or disprove his own identity.

इति = अत: कारणात्

स: = ईश्वर:

केन प्रकारेण साधयाम इति भाव:

साधयेत = प्रमातैव साधक:

If He be one who knows & acts i.e. possesses powers of knowledge & action; the Subject itself being as such, How is the word different from the Subject?

कर्तृ ज्ञातृ स्वभावम् इति चेत् = अगर ईश्वर ऐसे स्वभाव सहित है।

स प्रमातैव तथाभूत: = -२--

स = ईश्वर: पुर: स्थितस्यात्मन एव ईश्वरत्व. किमर्थम् अन्य ईश्वरं साधयाम इति भाव:

इति कोऽन्य: स: = इसलिए वह ईश्वर प्रमाता ही हो सकता है और कोई नहीं

It cannot be argued that the Subject is Omniscient or Omnipotent because "Omni" word does not imply any difference in the essential nature of the powers of action & knowledge.

सर्वकर्तृत्व सर्वज्ञत्वे प्रमातैव स: —

ईश्वर जैसा सर्वकर्तृत्व सर्वज्ञत्व भाव प्रमाता में निश्चय से नहीं पाये जाते हैं

न खलु सर्व शब्दार्थो ज्ञातृकर्तृत्वयो स्वरूपं भिनत्ति = य "सर्व शब्द" जो ज्ञातृता और कर्तृता का सम्बंध है यह इन का स्वरूप नहीं बदलता यानी जगत रूप होने से प्रमाता (Limited Subject) में भी है जहां यह विशेषण ईश्वर में है प्रमाता मे भी है॥

भेद दर्शनेऽपि = बौद्धादि दर्शनों में भी — और वेदान्त में भी

For even, according to dualistic sys-tem, the knowledge, action, desire of Lord being eternal are not affected by the objects in any way, because these are not their (knowledge, action etc.) cause. ?

ईश्वर ज्ञान चिकीर्षा = ईश्वर ज्ञान संबन्ध में (कि ईश्वर की इच्छा, ज्ञान, क्रिया शक्तियां नित्य हैं) और जो जगत है वह प्रलय के समय समाप्त होता पुनः जगत की उत्पत्ती का कारण कोई नही सृष्टी स्वरूप रूप से ही होती है जिस का कोई कारण नही है ॥

अप्रयत्नाद् नित्यस्य = वह भी मानते है कि चाहे सैंकडों यत्न करो ईश्वर अनित्य नही है निश्चय से वह नित्य ही है।

S.

विषयेण अकारणभूतेन (जगता) = } जगत रूप विषय का कोई कारण नही है क्योंकि यह जगत कभी है कभी नही है और ईश्वर नित्य है ॥

अनाधेयातिशयत्वात (नित्य होने से)

If it be said that the objectivity of an object consists in being made to shine by the subject, we will say that what is essentially not-light cannot be made to shine. Darkness cannot become light.

प्रकाशमानतानयमेव विषयत्वम् इति चेत = प्रकाशमान होना ही विषयत्वम् वाला भाव होता है। अगर ऐसा मानें

तो — अप्रकाशस्वभावस्य तथात्वम — प्रकाशमानतायां नयनम् —

अनुचितम् —

न उचितम — Is not correct
अप्रकाश जो है वह अपने आप से ही प्रकाशमान नही बन सकता।

न हि प्रयत्नशतैरपि अग्नि अनग्नितां नेतुं शक्यते इति भावः

अप्रकाशस्वभावस्य = जो अप्रकाश स्वभाव वाला हो — जगत
तथात्वम = उस पर प्रकाशमानता का आरोपन करना।

Therefore प्रकाशमानस्वभावत्वे विषयोऽपि =

प्रकाशमान होकर ही यह जगत भी -

सर्वत्र = हर एक चीज़ कुछ भी हो

यह प्रकाश में ही डूबे हैं -

{ The ink is light alone everyway. ← प्रकाश एव निमग्नः = ब्रुडितः -

अग्निकण इव अग्निचये इति भावः

इति = अतः कारणात्

प्रकाशः = विषयरूपः प्रकाशलेशः

प्रकाशते = महाप्रकाशः साक्षाद् भवति ·

So all objects also are only the light by themselves

This is the basic principle

| एतावन्मात्र परमार्थत्व सति कः

सर्वज्ञासर्वज्ञ विभागः, अयं जीवः असर्वज्ञः अयं ईश्वरः सर्वज्ञ इति विभागो न भवति। परमार्थतः सर्वत्रैकप्रकाशस्वरूपत्वात् इति भावः

प्रमाणमपि एवं सिद्धत्वासिद्धत्वाभ्यां पर्यनुयोज्यम् =

प्रमाण द्वारा ईश्वर की सिद्धी या असिद्धि करना भी इसी तरह समझनी चाहिये।

एवं = प्रमातृवद् इति, तथा च अस्यापि प्रमातृवत् प्रकाशरूपत्वे ईश्वरत्वमेव आयाति इति भावः

{ प्रमाणं चेत्प्रकाशान्तर्गतं सिद्धं प्रकाश एव सः स्वात्मनः सिद्धिनिषेधौ किं कुर्यात्, असिद्धं चेत अप्रकाशस्वभावस्य तथात्वम अनुचितम् इति }

So even objects even are the light of Self - Always shining - even in sleep because being eternal we know the quality of sleep or awakening.

सिद्धिरपि = प्रमात्रादिवत्प्रकाशरूपैवेति भावः

अपि = तेन इह उक्तस्य निषेधस्य ग्रहणम्

नीलादिरूपतां आश्यन्तरे तस्मात् = फलितमाह विषयाभिमत = विषयभावेन

वस्तु ← वस्तु = ~~नीलसुखादि~~ प्रकाशोऽपि आत्मप्रकाशः फलितत्वेन उक्तः

आत्मतया स्वात्मत्वेन शरीरतया = स्वरूपत्वेन गृहीत्वा

Therefore assuming the form of what is ordinarily known as the object, the Self itself shines, free from all limitations. It shines to Him even in deep sleep; because otherwise the remembrance of it would be impossible.

सुषुप्तमपि प्रति प्रकाशते एव =

सुषुप्ती में भी यह आत्मा ही चमकता है -

and because it shines to other subjects also - अन्यथा = आत्म प्रकाशाभावे

सुषुप्तेरुत्थितो हि न किंचित् एव वेदिषमिति तामवस्थां स्मरत्येव, स्मरणं च गृहीते एव संभवति ग्रहणं च आत्मानं विना न सम्भवति, तस्य च स्वप्रकाशत्वमेव इति सुषुप्ति स्मृतिमंगीकुर्वतः (स्वानुभवस्यापह्नवायोगात्)

विच्छेदहेतु अभावेन = देश काल ही विच्छेद लाते हैं उन का यहां अभाव है

जाग्रत्प्रमातृपेक्षया ← अन्य प्रमात्रपेक्षया = नहि अन्य सुषुप्तावन्यः सुप्तो भवति

As for the difference of subjects from one another which is due to prakasha ← स्वपर प्रमातृ विभागस्य = स्व और पर विभाग जो है प्रमाताओं में (जब जैसे कहते एक दूसरे को तुम सोया था).

itself! it will be represented to be the manifestation of Maya ←

यह माया के कारण भेद है

ननु अयं प्रमाता प्रकाशता नाम

पुनः स कीदृशः इतीति न

विमर्श ?

ननु तस्य

"स्वात्म् स्वातन्त्र्यं च" → ननु तस्य स्वतंत्र्य किमरूपम् अस्तीत्याह ॥

अभेदे = परमार्थतः ~~नीलाद्~~ नीलादि संविदां (outer) सुखादि (inner) संविदां च संवित् एकत्वेऽपि

differentiation भेदनम् = भिन्नविषयतोपाधिना भेदेन भासनम्.
between objects

is the internally भेदिते च = भेदेन भासिते स्वात्मनि विश्रान्तिदानेन digestion of difference लयीकरणं - नानाविधा संविदो हि अन्तरार्थे by the understanding तोऽपि तत्वादुत्थाय तत्रैव लयी भवन्ति ॥
light (without being affected by the changeful nature at all. This is the freedom.

This is Lord Lordship's ever gloriousness - the highest glory

तदेव = यह स्वतन्त्र्य स्वभाव ही

अस्य = इस ईश्वर का पारमैश्वर्यं = परम ऐश्वरय भाव

मुख्यानन्दमयं रूपं = तत्काथी भावोद् भावनाऽन्यथानुपपत्त्याऽऽनन्दभीरितम्

प्रधानम्।

मुख्यस्यैव हि प्रथममुपादानं युक्तम इति भावः

रूपम् = स्वरूपं भवतीति

एवमुपात्तं = ऊपर के श्लोक में जो ग्रहण किया गया है "कर्तरि" पहिले

Active Power (Vimarsha) (of thinking) brings the thinking power ज्ञान into understanding so predominance has been given to Active Power by mentioning it first. Actually both these powers are only the Power of Freedom Swatantra Shakti & the glory & blissfulness of Lord

कर्तृ शक्ति ही विमर्शन शक्ति है इसी को प्रधानता दी गई है क्रिया शक्ति ही ज्ञान की प्रकटता करती है इसी लिए कर्तृता को प्रधानता दी है - इसी लिए श्लोक में भी कर्तरि शब्द का पहिले उच्चारण किया गया है ॥

तदेव तु = तत् कर्तरीत्येनन सूचित:

विभज्य = अलग करके ज्ञातरि = यह शब्द बाद में कहा है

ज्ञानपल्लवस्वभावा = ज्ञान पुष्टी भाव रूपा, बीजापेक्षया तत्पुष्टीभावरूपस्य तादृग्बीज सहस्रोत्पादकस्य द्रुमस्य स्फुटैव मुख्यतेति न कोऽपि विरोध:

This way freedom is the nature of Consciousness - इयम् = स्वातन्त्र्यरूपा संवित्स्वभावता = यही है संविद् स्वभावरूपता - ज्ञानक्रिया शक्तिमान्

विकल्पत्वेन = शब्दस्पर्शगतेन विकल्पविषयत्वेन

[illegible Urdu annotation]

प्रमेयताम् - शब्दप्रमा विषयताम्

स्पृशन्ती →

Reality.

सृष्टत्वात् = प्रमेयतास्पर्शेनागतात् सृज्यमानत्वात्

It will be stated later, that if he it be referred by the word Samvit, then that would mean, it is an object of determinate knowledge, therefore objective & created & as such not ultimate

न परमार्थ संवित् = प्रमेयता भाव दिखलाने से तो यह शुद्ध संविद् नहीं हो सकती है।

प्रमेयताऽऽपादनस्य ~~कुतश्चित्~~ कुतश्चित्यपेक्षायाम् आह 'कीता'

कर्ता ज्ञाता च महेश्वर-इत्यभिधानेऽपि = अगर अब इस तरह भी कहा जावे (एवं विधिभावेन कथनेऽपि)

स एव प्रकारः — प्रमेयतास्पर्शीरूपः
नहि शब्दस्पृष्टं केनाप्युपायेन प्रमेयताम् अतिवर्तितु शक्तम्।

यथा यथा = येन येन प्रकारेण,

आपादन = प्रमेयभूमिकापद सिद्ध करना

प्रमेय भूमिका = प्रमेयावस्था (प्रमेय अवस्था रूप अनुमान करना कि इसे गुण कहता है)

न्यक्कार कलङ्क = इसे कलङ्क का अनादर करना

शक्यः = जितना हो सके

तथा तथा = उतना उतना

यावत् गति = यावदुपायम् यतितव्यम् = सर्वैरपि यत्नः कार्यः
प्रयत्न से प्रमेय भाव में नहीं जाता है॥

{यद्यप्यान्तर परामर्शो येन न संभवति तथापि
(शिष्येषु नैर्विकल्पापादन निमित्तमेतदुक्तम्-)

भूतविभक्त्या = अनुदेशायोग्य सिद्ध वस्तु वाचिन्या इ· प्रत्यरूपा सप्तमी विभक्त्या ·

इसलिए 'संविद्' पर और 'कर्ता' "ज्ञाता" पदों का प्रयोग नहीं किया गया है ॥

उपदेशावसरे = ले उपदेश करने के समय पर

सर्वात्मना = हर प्रकार से

पूय

{ उपदेशावसरे हि कर्तरि इति विषयत्वं युक्तम् ईश्वरस्य न तु वस्तुतः परमशिवस्थायामयमीश्वर इति अनुत्तरस्य निर्दिष्टत्वात्, उपचारत एव उपदेशकाले निर्देशः न तु तत्त्वतो वेद्यत्वम् ॥

धारा = परा काष्ठा उपैति = अङ्गीकरोति

अभिनवत्वेन = कुछ नये रूप से - घट रूप से

भासमानः - भासता हुवा ∴ पूर्वं न भासते = जो पहिले नहीं भासता था

स्वात्मनि = अपने ही स्वरूपसे → स्वस्मिन = अपने से

in his own unchanged self: see footnote on page 33 Book

अनपायरूपे = न दूर जाने स, न अभिन्न होने से

स्वभावे = एसा स्वभाव होने से — अपना स्वभाव जो अपने स्वरूप से अभिन्न है — See also Note No. 66 IVP Page 33.

वैशेषिकाद्यभिमता = उनहोंने आत्मा जड़ी माना है
तेषां प्रमेयत्वेन आत्मनो ऽभ्युपगमात्

इस "स्वात्मनि" पद के प्रयोग से उनके जडात्वाद को दूषित किया है ॥

अनादिसिद्धि = जो स्वतः सिद्ध है अविच्छिन्न प्रकाश रूप

इसके अनवच्छिन्न प्रकाश ~~रूप से~~ में ज्ञातृत्व और कर्तृत्व का स्वभाव होना ही इस का माहेश्वर भाव है यही इस का स्वातन्त्र्य है ॥

ॐ

असौ = घटादि प्रकाशः → प्रकाशसमस्त घटादिभावः

स्वतंत्रः = प्रकाशाव्यतिरेकेन सत्ता प्रमातृशक्ति

तत्र इति = फलितमाह – स्वात्मप्रकाशात्मनि अधीनत्वात्

कारकव्यापाराभावस्य सर्वान् प्रति सिद्धत्वेन दृष्टान्तत्वम्

स्वप्रकाशस्य भावः प्रमाणव्यापाराभावे हेतुः

कश्चित् वास्तवः – कोई सत्ता : नहीं

कारकव्यापारवत् = उत्पादन व्यापारवत्

अनित्य कारकव्यापारः घटवत्

अभिनव प्रकाशे प्रमाणव्यापारः

अत्र नित्यत्वेन प्रकाशात्मनि न कारकव्यापारः तथा स्वप्रकाशत्वेन न प्रमाणव्यापारः इति

अनेन ~~उत्पत्ति~~ उत्पत्ति सिद्धि, ज्ञप्ति सिद्धि द्वे निरास्ते ।

There is no activity of Causal agent in relation to Maheshwara neither means of right knowledge; because He is self-shining & eternal.

इह = भासमाने जगति विमृश्यते = विकल्प्यते

तथा ~~हि~~ प्रथते = तथा सत्तां भजते

अस्तित्वस्य = सत्तायः घटोऽस्ति इत्येवं रूपाया सत्तायाः, नीलाश्रयाया सत्ताया

शरणी कुर्वतः = साधकत्वेनाश्रयतः, रक्षकम्

प्रकाशः = चित् प्रकाशः

प्राणितदेशीयं = इस प्रकाश का जो जीवन भूत है वह विमर्श शक्ति है।,

चित् प्रकाश जीवन भूतम् –

प्रकाशो हि विमर्श सारः विमर्शोऽपि प्रकाश सारः इति भावः

आश्रित्य समुन्मेषात् = स्फुरत्वात्, अन्यथा दृष्टवीले सद्योजात

व
यदि अस्य सोऽभिनवत्वेन भासमान: ....

If the self, as conceived by him appears to him as new, it would mean that it did not shine before then it comes to be insentient, ~~but if it did not shine~~ and how would he, being an अजडात्मवादिन, disprove

तस्मात् संवित्प्रकाश एव.... = Therefore, the light of external object is non-different from the light of self. It (object) has no true independent existence.

परमात्मा is the same as आत्मा

इदन्ता

प्रकाश एव च आत्मा = And the Self is nothing but light, (the consciousness)

ननु : .... न संभवति = जब उत्पत्ती रूप या ज्ञप्ति रूप युक्ति से ईश्वर की सिद्धि संभव नही है ॥

What is then the nature of the activity which is referred to in the statement "I shall help in bringing about His Recognition".

"तत्प्रत्यभिज्ञामुपपादयामि" जो ऐसा आप ने कहा

कतमः = कस्य सम्बन्धीत्यर्थः

किंतु मोहवशादस्मिन्दृष्टेऽप्यनुपलक्षिते ।
शक्त्याविष्करणेनेयं प्रत्यभिज्ञोपदर्श्यते ॥ ३.

योजना :-

दृष्टे अपि, किंतु मोहवशाद् (माया-व्यामोहाद) अनुपलक्षिते (सर्वथा हृदयंगमीभावम् अप्राप्ते), अस्मिन् (आत्मनि) शक्तेः (असाधारण-दृकक्रियात्मिका शक्तिः) आविष्करणेन (प्रदर्शनेन) इयं प्रत्यभिज्ञा उपदर्श्यते (निरूप्यते).

English?

Though the powers of Self are already known,
(1) They are hidden from awareness due to delusion or forgetfulness (moha); pratyabhijna is, therefore, set forth to reveal those powers of Self.

(2) "But the help in bringing about the Recognition of Self is nothing but bringing to notice the powers of Self, which though known, yet is not fully realised, because its powers are obscured by the veil of Maya".

①

page 35

Karika (3)

But if neither the causal agent nor the means of right knowledge can be operative in relation to Maheshvara, what is then the nature of the activity which is referred to in the statement "I shall help in bringing about His recognition"? To this objection the author replies:-

(3). "But the help in bringing about the recognition of Self is nothing but bringing to notice the powers of Self, which, though known, yet is not fully realised, because its powers are obscured by the veil of Māyā."

There is no doubt about it that the Self, which is Omnipotent, manifests itself. It is free in its manifestations; therefore, there is no form in which it does not manifest itself. It shines in forms, which are self-luminous, as well as those which lack luminosity. While manifesting itself as self luminous it manifests either wholly luminous, or partly so. In manifesting itself as partly

P.T.O.

Self-luminous, it manifests itself either as distinct from the rest (eg. Jiva) or as identical with them (Mantra-maheshe). It also manifests itself as distinct from some (eg. Vidyesh-vara) or as identical with some (eg. विज्ञानाकलौ) or as including within itself all the forms mentioned above. Thus there are seven forms.

Of these the first is insentient (जडा) and the last is the Absolute (Parama Shiva). But those which come in between these 2 are the very limited sentient beings (Jivas). That power of the Great Lord, which is responsible for obscuration, and is called Māyā, partly obscures the Self, which is ever self-luminous. Self, therefore, is not fully visualised, is not realised in all its aspects and consequently it has no causal-efficiency, such as ~~when~~ it shows when it is fully realised. Hence, in order to arouse the consciousness of perfection of Self, the way to recognition (which has been explained already (in the first verse) is being shown). How? By exposing to view the perfect powers of knowledge

Contd on page 3.

and action, which are known to belong to the Lord. For, that which can be brought about by full conviction cannot be produced unless that conviction itself is produced. Accordingly the author gives an illustration — "By these various entreaties" etc.

The crux of the whole discussion may be stated as follows:—

The act of bringing about recognition of the Lord, is not the act of causal agent, nor that of one who makes things known. It is simply the removal of ignorance, For, the efficiency of the means of right knowledge, on which the practical life depends consists in that much only. For instance, the statement "this, that lies in front, is a jar, because it is directly perceived" does not make the jar known. For, it is also already known; because otherwise, the reason (because it is directly perceived) would be non-existent in the minor term: It simply removes the ignorance. Both ignorance & its removal, are simply

P.T.O

manifestations of Lord & nothing else & nothing more. This has already been stated & shall also be asserted later on (3)

किंतु — किम् इति = प्रश्नयोग्यतां
तु इति विशेषं द्योतयति
किंतु इति – असमाप्तवक्तव्यतां द्योतयन् –

मोहवशात् = मोहयति इति मोहः ईश्वरः तस्य वशः सामर्थ्यं मायाशक्तिः ततः
अहितो वा मोहः आवरणं, तस्य वशः

तस्याः मायायाः सामर्थ्यात् ॥

See note IVP No: 67 Page 35.

अस्मिन् = अस्मिन् ईश्वरे दृष्टेऽपि

अनुपलक्षिते = got blunt.

शक्त्याविष्करणेन = दृक्क्रियात्मिकाया शक्त्या-
स्वान् क्रियारूप (?) शक्तिः
उन के प्रकट करने से
Bringing into awareness higher powers of Comprehension (दृक्) and Action (क्रिया) of the [illegible] which are in fact His [illegible]
By revealing the extraordinary powers or profounder faculties of Self.

as in one's own Self already ever existing

उपपद्यते = निरूप्यते

In fact with the Help of his शक्तिपात अनुग्रह Power which is Swantra Shakthi transformed into his Omnipotence and Omniscience
[illegible] Action & Knowledge.

स: = कर्तृ ज्ञातृस्वभाव: तावत् = बालोपिनात्र विवादो

तत्र च = प्रकाशकतृत्वे च — स्वातंत्र्यात् हेतु इति अर्थ:

There is no form in which it does not manifest itself. ← न केनचिद्वपुषा = सर्वभावेन इति अर्थ:

न प्रकाशते, अपि तु प्रकाशते इति अर्थ:

i.e. in all forms only He is the reality.

सर्वाणि भा चानानि तत्स्वरूपभूतान्येवेति भाव:

illumine (light) तत्र = सर्ववपुषा प्रकाशं विभज्य कथयति "तत्र" — तत्र सतीत्यर्थ:

तत्रापि = दोनों वेद्य वेदक भावसे

अप्रकाशात्मना = वेद्यभावेन — जड (प्रथम:) which lack self-luminosity. (objective world)

प्रकाशात्मना = वेदकभावेन (subject) (द्वितीय:). Self-luminous

∴ or partly so as given

स एव भागश: सर्वस्य व्यतिरेकेण (तृतीय:) — पशुभाव होने से भिन्न भिन्न रूपसे.

चतुर्थ: ← अव्यतिरेकेण (wholly) = न भिन्न होने से — ?

(कतिपयस्य) व्यतिरेकेण = जहां ~~किंचि~~ किंचिद् भिन्नता होती है — शुद्धविद्या और ईश्वर अवस्था में (पंचम:).

(कतिपयस्य) अव्यतिरेकेण वा = विज्ञानकल: अवस्था में (षष्ठ:).

~~सब~~ स एव प्रकाशात्मा प्रकाश:

उक्ता ये प्रकारा: तै: परिपूर्णतया सप्तम: प्रकार:

तत्र = प्रकारसप्तक मध्ये

प्रथम: = अप्रकाशात्मना प्रकाश:

जडोल्लास: = वेद्यजृंभणेत्यर्थ: (भाववर्ग:).

तस्य स्वग्रहणेऽपि पराक्षेपत्वादिति भाव:

अन्त्य: = उक्त प्रकार परिपूर्णतया प्रकाशात्मना प्रकाश:

परमशिवात्मा = सप्तत्रिंशरूप परशिव रूप:, अन्त: कृत-तत्त्व षट्त्रिंशकस्यैव तत्त्वस्य परशिवत्वात्

मध्यमा जीवाभासाः = सर्वात्मना प्रकाशाख्यः पञ्च तत्र प्रथमतृतीयस्य शिवता शुद्धप्रकाशरूपत्वात् ⊕

*. These refer to Siva and Mantarmaheshwara which constitute the first and the third pramatrs of the the above-mentioned group of five.

जीवत्वं ↔ ⊕ जीवं चास्य महापूर्णत्वाभाव कृतमेव ज्ञेयम न भेद्यशीत्वकृतमेव ॥ ~~ज्ञेयम~~

सैव — जीवाभासरूपैव। मायायाश्च शुद्धविद्यानन्तरं स्थितत्वेऽपि शिवपदे तावदुपर्यपि स्पर्श आगमेषूक्त अन्यथा एकस्य परमशिवस्यैव परमार्थतोवस्थाने एव। का तद्व्यतिरिक्त तत्त्वषडविंशात्क चर्चा स्याद् ॥

तद्वशात् — तस्याः मायायाः सामर्थ्यात्

भगवतो माया विमोहिनी नाम शक्तिः —
मुहिवी मोहः आवरणं, तस्य वशो विच्युतिः इति — क्रियया शक्तिः, तथा च शक्तिमान् आक्षिप्यते, तेन पशुमातृणाम अख्यातिरूपा मोहः, कारणं च अस्य ईश्वर शक्तिः ॥ (स्वतन्त्र शक्ति)

जडचेतनवेद्य रूपेण ← भागेन = वेद्यरूपेण स्वांशेनानन्दरूपेणांशेन वा, नहि मायावशो वेद्यं स्वात्मतया प्रकाशात्माने वानन्दरूपतया गृहणाति ॥

प्रकाशात्मतया = चितरूपतया सततम् = त्रैकालिकं

अवभासमानोऽपि = इष्टपि

अप्रकाशनवशात् = माया के मोह के कारण विमर्शन पद पर न पहुंचते हैं ॥

"अनुपलक्षित" — सर्वथा हृदयंगमीभावमप्राप्ते
(विवमेश पद पर नहीं पहुंचतहै)

चमत्काररूप माहेश्वर्यस्य प्राप्तिरूप आनन्द आस्वाद रूपा.

{ पूर्णतावभासन = जो पूर्ण चिदानन्द चमत्कार रूप
साध्याम्
का होना (थी) है

अर्थक्रियाम् = प्रीति तृप्ति रूपाम्.

तत = तस्य - आत्मनः

पूर्णतावभासात्मक = निजपूर्णता स्फुरणरूपः यः
(अहं परामर्शः) = अभिमान विशेषः तस्य सिद्धये
परमार्थतस्तु परमार्थतस्तु का साक्षि
सर्वदैव संवेद्यमानोऽस्ति, अन्यथा तदर्थमपि स्थितमाहमाव

प्रदर्श्यते = उप समीपे हृदयंगमीनेन प्रधान्यतया दर्श्यते।

अं - रूपमोहात् माया का होना और अनुपलक्षितत्वं न पड़ना, पहचाना जाना परमेश्वर का स्वभाव इसके नि:

पथ्यां गमने अन पर्णादिवत न तु हृदयंगमी कृतः इति लघु मतां टिप्पणी.

यथा च

ईश्वरस्य स्वसंवेदन सिद्धत्वात् दृष्टत्वं केवलं माया-
व्यामोहात् अनुपलक्षितत्वम्, हृदयङ्गत्वं मार्गे दृष्टस्य तृणादेरिव।
यथा रथ्यागमने तृणादि भातमपि अभातमेव तृणादि-
विशिष्टरूपेण अविमृष्टत्वात् सति विमर्शे ने अर्थक्रियायामु-
पयुज्यते॥ तथा च अयमात्मा ईश्वरो दृष्टोऽपि तथा अनु-
पलक्षित इति स्वभावे हेतोः अत्यन्तोपादेयस्य दृष्टस्यापि
अविमृष्टस्य कथमुपादाने स्यात्। विमर्शपदवीम् प्राप्तया
ईश्वरसाधारण धर्मैः नित्यत्व विभुत्व - सर्वज्ञत्वादिभिः
समवाय शालिने स्वात्मानमविमृश्य कथं परम चमत्कार-
त्मानन्दरसास्वादनसम्पत्तिः स्यात् अर्थक्रियात्मा॥

अहं परामर्शः आनन्दः

HP. IPV note 69 Page 37.

यतः अयम ईश्वरो दृष्टोऽपि अनुपलक्षितः ततः
प्रत्यभिज्ञा तस्यैव प्रदर्श्यते।

ख्यापन = To make known.
अभिज्ञान = पहचान.

प्रक्रिया = How to do
शक्तियाः

शक्ति:
"शक्तेः" — शक्तिः असाधारणः प्रभावः अनीश्वरं
असंभाव्यः ~~स्व~~ ज्ञातृकर्तृत्वादिमाहात्म्यमिति यावत्,
तस्या आविष्करणम्, अभिज्ञानख्यापनम्, अभिज्ञानम्
एकधर्मात्मक रूपमुखेन अनन्तधर्मचित्रवस्तुस्वरूपे प्रवेशाय
उपायः प्रमितः स्वरूपसर्वस्व स्वीकारेण वस्तु ज्ञायते यथा
इति तस्य ख्यापनेन॥ IPV. note 70 page 37-38.

व्यवहार साधनानां = लोकेऽपि --
प्रमाणानां = प्रमाणों का (प्रत्यक्षादीनां).
तावत्येव विश्रान्ते = मोहापसारण मात्रे एव

घटोऽयमनुगम: = यह पक्ष है क्योंकि यह प्रत्यक्ष है
पक्ष: (साध्यं) यही साध्य है
प्रत्यक्षत्वात् -> (हेतु:)
{यह निर्विकल्प से ही सिद्ध है}
इत्यनेन ..... ज्ञाप्यते =
इतने से ही घट नहीं जाना जाता है

अन्यथा — भेदेन प्रकाशमानत्वाभावे
पक्षे - घटे, हेतोः - प्रत्यक्षत्वादित्यस्य
मोहमात्रम् = घटविषय: केवलो मोह:

अत्र हेतु प्रत्यक्षत्वादिति अनुगतायां हेतु: न तु घटज्ञापने
यदि घट: पूर्वमेव प्रत्यक्षो न स्यात् तर्हि घटो अयं इति
शब्देन कथं घट कोपि निर्देष्टुं शक्नुयादि इति अर्थ:
~~गतस इति च~~ इदम् प्रत्यक्षगतम इति युक्ति नयात्
प्रत्क्ष एव अयं इति भाव:

अनुगता = साध्या तस्मिनेव प्रत्क्षत्वे हेतु: इत्याशय:
⊕ अन्यथा ~~पक्षी~~ पक्षे हेत्वसिद्धि: उक्तनया अस्वीकारी
घटरूपे पक्षे हेतु असिद्धि: नहि कुत्रापि पक्षे हेतु: दृष्ट:

{प्रत्यक्षेणैव प्रकाशमान: प्रत्यक्ष से याने पहिले से निर्विकल्प दशा में प्रकाशमान था}

⊕ ~~ऐसा~~ करना फिर हेतु: की असिद्धि बनेगी - घट तो पहिले से ही निर्विकल्प में है केवल इस का अनुगम सिद्ध करना है — घट तो पहिले से ही सिद्ध है जैसे ईश्वर आदि सिद्ध है ॥

केवलं मोहापसारमात्रं : "घटोऽयम् ग्राग:"

प्रत्यक्ष प्रमाण से केवल मोहापसार होता है

(1) यथार्थं मोहः (2) तत् अपसारणं च =

मोह और मोह का अपसारण दोनों का दूर करना (शक्तिपात).

विजृम्भमात्रम् — शक्तिविलसित मात्रम् नतु तद्व्यतिरिक्तं किंचिदिति भाव:

यह शक्ति ही माया रूप से बन्धन करती है और अनुग्रह रूप से मोक्ष देती है ॥

इसी लिए अनुग्रह को ही "शक्ति पात" कहते हैं (1) बन्धन का पात = गिरना (नीचे)
(2) अनुग्रह का आपात = ऊपर (दैव कृपा) से आ पड़ना

(1) One must first understand the cause of Moha the three Malas; and

(2) Make then all possible efforts to get rid of Moha the solidification of the three Malas. Thereby one's life should be used only for these two purposes. Then & then only "Self Realization (प्रत्यभिज्ञा)

Can take place.

Thus teaching his process the following chapters.

1

Karika 4   page 39

Here one may ask: among the multiple objects of experience, whose power is revealed and to whom? For, there is no difference of opinion on this that insentients [illegible] do not possess the power of knowledge. And the power of action also, which owes its being to freedom, is impossible in them, because they have lost their freedom. It is for this reason that some maintain that in statements such as "Chariot is going" the use of the verb 'go' is due to transference of epithet (upchara). The position, therefore, that the power is revealed to the insentients is not at all reasonable. But if it be said both have reference to the sentient [illegible] living beings, then the hope to establish that Maheshvara is the Self of all becomes still more distant. Having raised this question, the author replies as follows:—

(4). "The being of the insentient depends entirely on sentient, and (powers of) knowledge and action are the very life of the sentient beings."

P.T.O

The word "नन्विह" indicated the commencement of the argument. It means "look here". Others hold that the word 'ननु' indicates what is to be proved and word 'इह' stands for the reason. It means that the statement of major term has the support of reason. Or the word 'नन्विह' means that all that has been said is right, in view of the reasons, which are going to be stated in the book, which is as yet, only in the mind of the author is tried to be brought before the mind's eye.

It is to be admitted that the multiplicity of the objects of world is as it is determinately apprehended; because the being (Astitva); which depends on the light of consciousness (Prakasha), which shines on the basis of determinate cognition, which refers to objects of experience. For, otherwise what will be the reply if one were to ask :- "Why is it that what has not been of the nature of 'being' nor that of 'not being' determinately apprehended is, neither 'blue' nor 'yellow', neither of the nature of being nor that of "not-being"? Therefore a thing is as

Contd on page 3

it is determinately apprehended, for as long a time as it remains uncontradicted. Hence it is that it will be asserted in the sequel, in the verse: "Action, relation & universal" that substance, action & relation which base involve temporal and spatial order are real, because, everyone of them shines in a separate determinate cognition.

Therefore, the whole of this vast universe, can be divided into (i) insentient and (ii) sentient, if we take summary (that short) view of it. Of these also, the insentients, as objects of determinate cognition, have no independent being. For, objectivity to cognition is not ~~insentient~~ their inherent quality, because in that case they will cease to be insentient. The insentient though they are essentially of the nature of of consciousness (चित्स्वरूपाः), yet they are reduced to the state of insentiency by the power of Lord, called Māyā. They, therefore, have their being only as related to & dependent upon sentient subject, as is testified by perpetual judgements such as "the blue shines to me" and "blue is the object of my knowledge". Hence the insentients

P.T.O.

have no separate independent being. This is what the author himself has said in the following verse:-

"Thus these insentients, which are as good as non-existent in themselves, have their being only in relation to light of Consciousness (prakasha). Light of Consciousness alone has independent being & shines as both self & not self."

That alone has independent being which shines independently of others. And because the so-called insentient is nothing independently of light of Consciousness, therefore the view that the power of insentients is revealed to insentients is baseless.

As regards those which are known to be sentients as distinct from the insentients, their bodies, vital airs, group of eight (Puryashtaka) and Shunya are insentient. Therefore we cannot attribute powers of knowledge & action to them. Hence only, that on the background of which alone the so called existing things, such as jar, body, prāṇa, pleasure & their not-being shine, is Sentient & these —

Contd on page 5

Page 5

And although apparently it appears to be multi- (उपाधि departing) ple, yet its multiplicity is due to the limiting conditions constituted by the body etc which are essentially insentient (knowable objects). Hence its multipli-city is unreal, because it involves logically fallacy, called "Anyonyashrya". For, variety of the sentients is due to variety of the insentients, and the difference of the insentient is due to that of the sentients eg. "this is his body", + "this is his object of knowledge". The variety of parti-cular objects such as blue and yellow; as it shines on the background of subject, so it has multiplicity only. What of that? Therefore it is established that all the individual subjects are really one and that subject is characterised by life. And life consists in doing the act of living in the form of knowing and acting. For, only he is said to be living who knows + acts. Therefore, the individual subject is to be looked upon as Lord, ~~of whom we know from purana and~~ (because he possesses the powers of knowledge and action like the Lord, of whom we know from purana and Itihasa. Even if the be not known as such from purā-nic tradition. He has to be admitted as such. For, lordliness is essentially nothing

P.T.O.

more than the possession of powers of knowledge and action, in relation to all objects, because it is dependent on that much only. This basis of this admission is knowledge of invariable concomitance of the two, acquired from such instances as acknowledged king etc., e.g. "He who has freedom of knowing and acting in a particular field is the lord of it, like a king": because it is against the essential nature of one who is not lord to have freedom of knowledge & action. And it is the self which knows and acts in all fields. Therefore, this doctrine of recognition is proved.

The 2 transcendental categories (i) Sadashiva and (ii) Isvara, are nothing more than powers of knowledge and action respectively, before the rise of gross distinction between & their objects, Vidya & Kala are due to the rise of general distinction between them & their objects. Similarly the group of powers of sense-organs & organs of action is due to the rise of specific distinction. At the time of imparting instructions there is the consciousness of distinction between the insentient as life-less and the sentient as living, but there is no consciousness of Samvit (in its essential nature, as one which manifests itself in all forms). Hence the word "जीवित" in the text stands for the sentient objects.

Amongst the multiple objects of experience { परिदृश्यमाने = दृष्टि में जो है भावराशौ = जडाजडरूप 36 तत्त्वादि समूह : मध्ये

किमीया = कस्य सम्बन्धिनी

किस की शक्ति कही है — के च प्रति = जडानां अथवा अजडानां प्रति { whose power is revealed to whom.

शक्तिराविष्क्रियते = यह जडपदार्थ सम्बन्धिनी है या अजड पदार्थ सम्बन्धिनी है ॥

जडानां .... = जडत्वे हि ज्ञानक्रिया शक्तिराहित्यमेव इति भाव:

Power of action which owes its existence being due to freedom is impossible in them. क्रियात्मिकापि = क्रियारूप शक्ति अगर कहो जडपदार्थ में है ॥ वह तो स्वातन्त्र्य प्राणा है

स्वातन्त्र्यप्राणा = विमर्श प्राणा

because they have lost their freedom. ← स्वातन्त्र्यापगमात् = जब स्वातन्त्र्य, (विमर्श हीन हो) ही नष्ट हुआ हो

असंभावनाभूमिरेव = तो ऐसी बात जडपदार्थ में (is impossible). (state of impossibility) संभव ही नहीं ॥

प्रतिपन्ना: = अंगीकृतवन्त: The use of [illegible] 'go' is only transformation of an epithet

or if it be said that both (ज्ञान + kriya) have reference to sentient beings alone. न च जडा-प्रति --- उचितम् = न च उचितम्, तेषां व्यवहारकर्तृत्वासम्भवादिति भाव: → is not reasonable.

अथ अजडजीवज्ञनताधिकारेण = केवल चैतन्य प्रमातृनाम् प्रति

अजडानामत्र शक्ताविष्कारणादिति भाव: ← उभयमपि = ज्ञान क्रिया शक्ति: दोनों (केवल वही केवल इन शक्तियों के अधिकारी होने से)

तर्हि.... महेश्वर इति = यदि जडेषु न शक्तिरेव नास्ति - तर्हि कथं भवता उक्तम " सर्वस्य जडाजडरूपस्य स्वात्मा महेश्वर एव]

(सर्व शब्द ने जड पदार्थ किस तरह फिर ग्रहण किया)-

Then the hope to establish that the Maheshwara is the Self all gods aged becomes still more distant. (more difficult to assert or prove) So for that purpose he starts the shastra with "तथा हि"

दूरतरं विप्रकर्षिता = अतिदूराद् दूरतरं प्रापिता (far fledged idea)

प्रत्याशा = अनाशासने प्रवृत्ता आशा प्रत्याशा.
(जिस बात पर भरोसा न करना था उसी पर भरोसा करना

Ques.
The world comprises of multiple objects of experience sentient and insentient. It is only sentients who possess powers of knowledge and action. Insentients do not either possess power of knowledge or power of action. How is it then possible to establish that Maheshwara is the Self of all?

तथा हि जडभूतानां प्रतिष्ठा जीवदाश्रया।
ज्ञानं क्रिया च भूतानां जीवतां जीवनं मतम्॥ ४॥

योजना :- तथा हि (दृश्यतां किल) जडभूतानां प्रतिष्ठा (अवस्थानम्) जीवदाश्रया ("जीवन्तं" - प्रमातारमाश्रित्य भवति) ज्ञानं क्रिया च जीवतां भूतानां जीवनं मतम्॥

Ans. It is an evident fact that the existence of insentients depends upon sentient beings and the (powers of) knowledge and action are admitted to be the very life of living beings (sentients).

"तथाहि" = इस पद से [शास्त्र] अनुमान का आरम्भ करता है

युक्त्य = शक्तियाविष्करणरूपः उपायः
तस्या उपक्रमः - आरम्भः ✓ } It indicates Commencement

Indicates. द्योतति = सूचयति - दृश्यतां किल इत्यार्थः Shows

"तथा" इत्यनेन - साध्यं = पक्ष सिद्ध करना - or it mean "What is to be proved."
अहमीश्वरः, इत्येवं रूपमीश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञा
रूपं आत्मैवेश्वर एतदेव साध्यं

"हि" — किल - हेतु - stands for reason. (सर्वस्य स्वात्मा महेश्वरः) सिद्ध करने के लिए

प्रकृतं साध्यं = प्रत्यभिज्ञारूपं साधनीयं वस्तु

हेतुसिद्ध्यायत्तम् = It means that the statement of major-term has the support of reason. = Reasons supporting the thesis — or in view of the reasons which are going to be stated in this book;

बुद्धिवर्तिना = बुद्धि परिवर्तित्वेनैव, बुद्धौ स्फुरत्त्वेनैव — which is as yet in the mind of the author

बुद्धि में प्रवर्तन में आने से स्मृत्य आती है
जब तक बुद्धि में स्फुरण न आये तब तक
क्या कहा जायेगा ॥ By simple thinking "All this is Maheshvara" is clear. — No the proof starts through this book.

Requiring to be established by intellect for [illegible] is tried is to brought through remembrance in the mind's eye

स्मर्यमाणेन = स्मृत्य में लाने से — remindiance

ग्रन्थेन = प्रत्यभिज्ञारूपेन कारिकासन्दर्भेण — or mention through this scripture.

"हि" — यस्मात् Surely the thesis starts here :— is to be appended by determinately

① Every thing is, and it is observed in the world, nothing less more plus.

इह = भासमाने जगति यथा विमृश्यते = विकल्प्यते
तथा अस्ति = तथा सत्ता भजते

Because the beingness of a — अस्तित्वस्य = सत्ता यः घटोऽस्ति इत्येवं रूपाया सत्तायाः,
नीलाद्यायाः सत्ता या - [existance

Here "all is" "a thing it is" observed. — शरणी कुर्वतः = साधकत्वेनाश्रयतः, रक्षकम्.
is depends on light of consciousness which is the life of विमर्श. observation.

प्रकाशः = चित् प्रकाशः or Light of consciousness

Shines on the basis of determinate cognition — प्राणितरेशीयं = चित् प्रकाश जीवन भूतम्, प्रकाशो हि विमर्श सारः विमर्शोऽपि प्रकाश सारः इति भावः

आश्रित्य समुन्मेषात् = स्फुरनात्, अन्यथा दृष्टुनीले सद्योजातबालेऽपि तत्सत्ता समुन्मेषादिति भावः (which refers to the objects of experience)

(if undetermined) quality – nature could not be known.

यद्यविमृष्टम् = विकल्प विषयी कृत न स्यात् तदा तद्वस्तु नीलमपि सत नीलं न भवति, तथा सदपि सत् सत् न भवति ॥

For otherwise what will be the reply if one were to ask: "why is it not ..." what has not been determined apprehended is neither "blue ...... nor not-being"

तथा "न पीतम्" = पीतम् अत्र उपलक्षणम्, अनीलम् अपि न भवति, तथा सत् अपि न भवति, संक्षेपतः अनिर्वाच्यं भवतीति यावत् ॥
(indescribable)

कुतः इति पर्यनुयोगे किम् उत्तरं स्यात् =

कुत इदं नीलं कुत इदं सत् एवं केनचिदाक्षेपे क्रियमाणे, तद्वस्तु किम् उत्तरं यस्य तत् तादृशं स्यात् यथा तदस्ति तदपि न वक्तुं शक्यते, यथा च नास्ति तदपि न वक्तुं शक्यते, केवलं मौनदशैवायातीति भावः। (there could be no explanation offer an undetermined object)

पर्यनुयोग = enquiry with the object of refuting or contradicting a statement.

तेनेदं = यतः सतः साधने विमर्शस्यैव सामर्थ्यं ततः कारणात् इति अर्थः

Therefore a thing is as it is determined apprehended, for as long as it remains uncontradicted

यद् = (वस्तु) यथा यावत् = घटाकारः पटाकारः. जिस वस्तु का जैसा आकार हो।

अबाधितं = जब तक देश काल से बाधित न किया गया हो – (केवल घट-रूप).
unless determined otherwise.

विमृश्यते = विमृश में लाया जाता है। तत तथा = वह वस्तु उसी प्रकार से (तेनैव प्रकारेण)

अस्ति = सत्तां लभते

because they shine i.e. separate determinate cognition

तत् एव = यतः सत्तः सिद्धौ विमर्शस्यैव सामर्थ्यं ततः।

विततात्मना = विभिन्नः अपि

Action, relations, substance all these involve univeral & special order are all real

द्रव्य = प्राक्रियाधारो द्रव्यं

क्रियासंबन्धादयः – क्रिया-संबन्ध आदि (एकानेकरूप) (सामान्य)

एकत्वेन परमार्थसन्तः =

↳ एक प्रमाताश्रित तया

आभास परमार्थी हि सर्वे भावाः इत्याभास स्थाने प्रमातरि च विश्रान्तत्वात् प्रमातृ विश्रान्तं च (~~तेनैव प्रकारेण~~) वस्तूनां परमार्थकम् रूपं इत्येकत्वेनैव परमार्थ सन्त इति॥

Both insentient & non insentient

"ततश्च" —— विततमपि इदं विश्वं ....

विततमपि = निसंख्याक भेद युक्त

if we take the summary view

संक्षेपविमर्शदशाधिरोहे = संकुचित विमर्श पदी पर आकर

जड जीवत् च = जड और चैतन्य पदार्थ केवल दो रूप है।

तेन = जडाजडयोर्मध्ये विमृश्यमाना = विकल्पविषयीकृताः

एका स्वतन्त्रा = स्वधीन सत्ताकाः

विमृश्यमानता = विमर्श विषयी भावः

स्वशरीरे = स्वस्वरूपे विश्रान्तः = स्थितियुक्तः

For objectivity to cognition is not their inherent quality, because in that case the will cease to be insentient.

कोऽपि धर्मः = यह धर्म तो जड शरीर का तो नहीं है। नाहि स धर्मः कुत्र विश्रान्तोऽस्तीति चेत् चेतनेष्विति ब्रूमः, एतदेव हि चैतनत्वं यद्विमर्शसामर्थ्यम्॥

जडत्वाभाव = — इति चेतसि कृत्वा हेतुमाह

ननु तर्हि तेषां जडानां कथं सिद्धिरस्तीत्यपेक्षायामाह

"मम नीलम्" इति

मम नीलं भाति मया नीलं ज्ञायते = इति भान क्रिया कर्तृत्वेन ज्ञानक्रियाविषयत्वेन च।

तेषां = जडानाम् चिन्मयत्वेऽपि = परमार्थदृष्ट्याश्रयणेन चिद्रूपत्वेऽपि सति ॥

तथा च घटोयं मम स्फुरति इति कोर्थः मदीयं *, स्फुरणं स्पंदनं आविष्टः सद्रूपतामापन्नः एवं चिन्मय-सद्रूपताविष्ट एव चिन्मयत्वात् ॥ चिन्मयत्वेऽपि पर-धाम्नि न किंचित् जडम् नाम इति [illegible] नयो इति भावः ॥

मायाख्यया ईश्वर शक्त्या = स्वात्म विस्मृतिरूपया मायाशक्त्या -

जाड्यं प्रापितानाम् = वेद्यभावमानीतानां सताम् - ← "they are reduced to insciency"

आश्रित्य = स्वविषयीभूत भान ज्ञानाख्य क्रियाद्वय आश्रय - ~~[illegible]~~ त्वेन

* "प्रतिष्ठा" — प्रमातृग्राहकतया ← तत् प्रमातृ अभिमुख्येन अवस्थानं ॥

* They therefore have their being only as related to & dependent upon sentient.

अवस्थानम् = स्वरूपलाभरूपावस्थितिः भवति ॥

ततः = फलितमाह

पृथक = ग्राहकमनपेक्ष्यार्थाः न सन्ति = स्वसत्तां न लभन्ते ॥

यथोक्तम् :

By themselves — have their being → are insentient — are as good as non-existent.

एवमात्मन्यसत्कल्पाः प्रकाशस्यैव सन्त्यमी । *

जडाः प्रकाश एवैकः स्वात्मनः स्वपरात्मभित् ॥

* only in relation * Light of Consciousness.

↓ Light of Consciousness alone has independent being both as Self & not-Self.

घटादिरूपः विमर्शः
असमर्थत्वात् ←
असत्तरूपः

एवमात्मनि = मायया सिद्धे जडरूपे स्वस्मिन्

अकल्पा = विमर्शसमर्थत्वेनासिद्धरूपाः अमी जडाः = नीलादयः

प्रकाशस्यैव सन्ति = प्रकाश सम्बन्धिन एव भवन्ति। वेद्याः
तद्ग्राह्यताकाले एव ~~स्वरूप~~ स्वरूपलाभात् पर-
तंत्रा एव भवन्ति यावत्

अतः एकः – केवलः

प्रकाश एव स्वात्मनः अस्ति = स्वप्रकाशत्वेन स्वग्रहणे परापेक्षा-
भावेन स्वसम्बन्धी भवति-
स्वतंत्रो भवति –

स्वपरात्मभिः = वेदकभावेन वेद्यभावेन च, उपलक्षितः

स्वात्मा सन् =
स एव हि स्वसंबन्धित्वेन स्थितः

Shines independently of others. ←

अन्यानुपहितम् = ग्राहकतया स्थितेनान्येन न विच्छिन्नी-
कृतम्

उपाहित = संबद्ध
= सम्मिलित

ननु इमपि तादृशमेव भवत्वित्यत आह "न च".

भारूपानुपहितम् = प्रकाशरूपेण ग्राहकेणानवच्छिन्नी-
कृतम्
(यदि प्रकाश ने स्वीकार न किया हो)

निरुत्थानमेव = असंभाव्यम्

जड एव = न तु चेतनाः, स्वग्रहणे परापेक्षत्वात्, न हि देहस्य
स्वग्राहकत्वम् –

तेषामपि = अजडसम्बन्धिनां शरीरादीनामपि

किमुच्यते = तेषामपि ज्ञानक्रिये न युक्ते इति भावः।
तर्हि केषां शक्तिराविष्क्रियते – आह – अतश्च

and their not-being shine – is St. sentient.

तदभावरूपः = घटादीनामभावः यत् लग्नम् = यत् निष्ठं सत्

आपाते = विवेकात्पूर्वम् तत् = बहुत्वभानम् its multiplicity

जडात्मकवेद्यः .... = नीलादयः – देहप्राणादयः, त एव
उपाधिः

ततः = उपाधेर्हेतोरित्यर्थः अपरमार्थिकर = असत्यभूतम् (is unreal)

अन्योन्याश्रयात् = इतराश्रयात् दोषात् -
यदन्योऽश्रयं तत न सत्

जीवा = चेतना हि — यस्मात् जडभेदात् = देहादि भेदात् हेतोः

(For variety of sentients is due difference in insentients and difference in insentients is due to variety in sentients.)

भेदभागिनः सन्तः, एव देहो येषां ते,
एकं वेधा येषां ते ॥

भेदमीयुः = प्राप्नुन्ति, अन्यथैकप्रकाशमात्ररूपत्वात्

नीलपीतादि भावभेदाः = नीलपीतादयो भावविशेषाः
आदि = बाह्यानामान्तराणां सुखादीना

(The variety of particular objects such as 'blue' and 'yellow', as it has multiplicity only.)

भेदभूमिम् = नीलादिभावेन भासनरूपां भेदकक्ष्याम्

परम् = केवलम् अधिरोढा = आश्रितवन्तः

तेन = तेषां भेदभूम्यारोहणेन

किम् = अस्मिन् समये जीवैक्यमात्रस्यैव प्रकृतत्वात्.
(What of that?) न तेन कापि हानि इति अर्थः

(When the jiva the pramata is established the objective world is proved.)

जीवैक्ये सिद्धे जडैक्यस्यायत्नसिद्धत्वम् एव
इति भावः

(Therefore it is established that the individual subjects are really one & that subject is characteristic of life.)

फलितमाह — "तदयम" — अतः कारणात्

जीवानामः ... जीव प्रमाता = एको जीवनकर्ता प्रमातः इति

जातम् = सिद्धम्

जीवनं च = जीवन क्रिया कर्तृत्वं च स्वातन्त्र्यं

ज्ञानक्रियात्मकं = प्रकाशविमर्शात्मकं

(and life consists in doing the act of living in the form knowing & acting.)

करोति च = अन्यथा मृतस्यापि जीवत्वं स्यात्

इति व्यवहृतेश्च ···· = पुराणागमादिषु च
सर्वज्ञः सर्वकर्ता च ईश्वर — प्रसिद्ध इति
आत्मापि तादृश एव अनुमातव्य इति
भावः

ऐश्वर्यम् = परमेश्वरभावः

on that much only ← तन्मात्रस्य = सामान्य ज्ञानक्रिया शक्ति मात्रस्य, न तु सर्वविषयस्य,

This maxim depends ← योनुबन्धः = योगः सोस्यास्तीति तन्त्रानुबन्धी तस्य भावस्तत्त्वं तस्मात् ॥

सिद्धम् = आत्मनि निष्पन्नं भवति

तथा चैवं प्रयोगः, अयमात्मा सर्वविषय ज्ञानक्रिया शक्तिमान, ज्ञानक्रिया शक्ति योगात् ॥

अनीश्वरस्य = जो राजा न हो (व्यतिरेक व्याप्तिः)

Because it is against the essential nature of one who is not lord to have freedom of action & knowledge.

स्वभावविरुद्धं = उस की वहां व्याप्तिः न होने से

अतः = अतः कारणात्

प्रत्यभिज्ञा = नूनं स सर्वेश्वरोऽहमिति- प्रत्यभिज्ञानम् =

आत्मा..... कर्ता च = It is the Self which knows & acts in all fields.

अत्र च ज्ञानक्रियायोग मात्रेणापि सर्वविषय ज्ञानक्रियायोग रूपमैश्वर्यमग्निकण दृष्टान्तेन सिद्ध्यति। कणभावेण स्थितोऽप्यग्निर्महेन्धन चयदाहेऽपि समर्थ एव दृश्यते।

अनुमान से ईश्वर सिद्धि :-

(1) पक्ष - साध्य ⟶ सर्वविषय ज्ञानक्रिया शक्तिमत्त्व स्वभावमेव ऐश्वर्यं - ज्ञातृत्व, कर्तृत्व जो स्वतन्त्र्य रखता है वही ईश्वर है ॥

See again - ↑ जीवनं च जीवनकर्तृत्व तत च ज्ञानक्रियात्मकं यो हि जानाति च करोति च स जीवति

(2) हेतुः ⟶ निजं ज्ञान क्रिया शक्तियोगाद् ईश्वर इति

(3) व्याप्ति ⟶ आत्मा च विश्वत्र ज्ञाता कर्ता च

(4) उदाहरण ⟶ यो यो ज्ञान क्रिया शक्तिमान् स ईश्वरः
⟶ यथापुराणागमादि सिद्धेश्वरवत् - सर्वविषय ज्ञानक्रिया शक्तिमत्त्व स्वभावमेव ऐश्वर्यं

उपनय ⟶ आत्मा च विश्वत्र ज्ञाता च कर्ता च.

निमग्न ⟶ शक्तिविष्करणेन अहं महेश्वरः
शक्त्याविष्करणेन

ज्ञान क्रियाशक्ती एव = परदशायामहमिति स्वरूपे
पूर्णदशाया

स्वाभाविक्यौ = परमेश्वरस्वभावाव्यभिचारिण्यौ

अपरूढः = बीजभावेन स्थितत्वात् अंकुरभावगतः

भेदोन्मेषे = इदन्ता उन्मेषः
यह सदाशिव अवस्था है
इदंतारूपभेदस्फुरणं ययो ते - अहंभाव-
प्रधानत्वात इति भावः

इदन्ता पर अभी न चढा हुआ —
अकारभावगतो भेदोन्मेषः, इदन्तारूपभेदस्फुरणं अहंभाव प्रधानत्वात्

यद्यपीश्वरस्य भेदाभेदयो सधृततुलापुटन्यायेन सम-
प्राधान्यम्, तथापि समीपवर्तित्वेन समकक्षतया
सदाशिवेन सह ग्रहणम्, अथवा च ज्ञानशक्तिः
सदाशिवत्वम। क्रिया शक्ति ईश्वरत्वम्.

भेदस्य सामान्यतः — यहां भेदाभेद एक जैसे
है — यहां विद्या कुल
शुद्ध विद्या में है —

विशेषताः प्ररोहे =

आपाते = उपदेशकाले

न तु संवित् — सर्वभावेन स्थितः प्रकाशः

एतः कारणात् → जीवतामिति →

जनी जङ्गमा – लक्षणया प्रमातार एव .

इत्थं = चेतनया ज्ञानक्रियारूपया ॥

तत्र ज्ञाने स्वतःसिद्धं क्रिया कायाश्रिता सती ।
परैरप्युपलक्ष्येत तयान्यज्ञानमूह्यते ॥५॥

योजना :- तत्र (तयो ज्ञान क्रिययोर्मध्ये) ज्ञाने स्वतः सिद्धम् । क्रिया अपि (स्वतः सिद्धा, सा) कायाश्रिता-सती परैरुपलक्ष्येत । तया (क्रियया) ·

ननु ज्ञानक्रिये .... प्रसाधयितुमाह :-

Ques! How do you establish the existence of powers of knowledge and action in the individual subject due to which the he can be said to possess lordliness (Maheshvarya)?

Ans! Out of these two powers, the power of knowledge is self-established and the power of action (which is also self established) is perceptible) is perceptible to other perceivers, as it is associated with a particular body. From that (action) the presence of (the power of) knowledge in others is inferred.

ज्ञान क्रिये एव = ज्ञान क्रियाभ्यां
कथं सिद्धे = तत् सिद्धेव यतः → याभ्यां ज्ञानक्रियाभ्यां तत्सिद्धेर्वा ।
ऐश्वर्यव्यवहारः - आत्मनीति शेषः
प्रसाध्यते → प्रकर्षेण साधनविषयतां नीयते

Karika 5.

But it may be asked: how do you establish the existence of powers of knowledge and action (in individual subject) which alone can justify the attribution of possession of bodliness to him? To answer this question the author says:-

(5) "Of these (the power of) knowledge is self-established; and so also (the power of) action. The latter, when associated with a particular body, is perceptible to others limited perceivers. From that the presence of (the power of) knowledge in others is guessed."

All the three forms of cognitions: (i) I know (ii) I knew (iii) I shall know shine on the back ground of self-luminous self-consciousness only. There is none to be discussed about it. For, if the self were not shining, the whole world would be nothing but mass of darkness, or it would not be even that. Even (the statement of) a child conveys the idea of self-luminosity of self. This is what

P.T.O.

is asserted in :-

O People "Through what means of knowledge can the knower be known?"

If we deny self-shining nature to subject, there remains no room for question & answer. In the cognitive experience such as, "I know", there is consciousness (not only of self-~~consciousness~~ luminous self but) of association with a stir (spanda) also. It is because of this stir that self is admitted to be of sentient nature, as distinct from the qualities such as white etc, which are essentially insentient. This stir is technically called "Vimarsha". It is the power of action. This is what has been asserted by our great-grand-teacher Somananda :-

"At the time of cognition of jar, etc the subjective stir in relation to jar is action."

Therefore, internal power of action, like that of cognition is self-established & self-shining. That very internal power of action,

contd on page 3.

because of its inherent power, enters into body, through vital air, and the group of eight and being of stirring nature in itself, becomes directly perceptible as physical action in the sphere of Māyā. That physical action, when seen in another person's body, logically makes us guess (the presence of) the power of (own) knowledge (ज्ञान:) which is its essential nature.

And the light of consciousness (ज्ञान:) does not shine as thisness. For, 'thisness' is negation of knowledge (ज्ञान). And a thing that is cognised in the form of something else cannot be said to be truly cognised. But the fact that light of consciousness shines, cannot be denied. And that which shines is the essential nature of the subject. Hence the light of consciousness which is associated with another person at the empirical level is non-different from the light of consciousness of the cognising subject. The otherness is due to the limiting conditions of it. And if we proceed to think rationally we discover that the limiting conditions itself is non-different from self. Hence from the philosophical point of view, all the subjects are one. That one alone is. This is asserted in the following:—

P.T.O.

"It is one & the same Self that shines, as one's own Self as well as selves of others".

Therefore all knowledge whether it be in Sadasiva state or in a worm, is the knowledge of one knower. Hence the omniscience of the Subject is established as a conclusion from the premises. The same can be asserted in regard to the action of the as Subject. This is what has been asserted in regarded in regard to the action of the Subject. This is what has been so asserted by our great-grand-teacher in Shivdrsti :—

"Jar (is one with my Self at the time of my desire to know and therefore) knows one with myself. And I am one with Jar in knowing. Sadashiva knows as my self. And I know as Sadasiva. Siva alone shines, knowing himself through multiplicity of objects" etc.

The word "is guessed" (ऊह्यते) indicates that the power of knowledge is not an object of any means of right knowledge. Otherwise he would have used the word "is inferred" (अनुमीयते).

Contd on page 5

5

Thus, those, who have not been altogether blinded by (the fall of dust of) ~~disclosure~~ discourse of logicians to this path, enter into Him when they realise through the above dialectic the identity of the individual Self & the Universal & merge everything, such as jar, body, vital air, pleasure & even their not-being, in Him. Therefore this is the introduction (उपोद्घातः) because like a chisel, it is instrumental in bringing out the distinctive features of the case (उपाधिः) due to recognition. This much alone is the purpose of this book.

It, (the 1st chapter) can be spoken of as an introduction for the reason that through brief presentation of the system, it removes ignorance about what is primarily to be presented in the book; or the root 'Han' may be taken to mean 'to know' because it means to go, and therefore, it may be called introduction, because through this purport of the book is known. Some, however, hold the meaning of 'Han' (हन्) "to go" is limitted to going to women. Thus, through undisturbed contemplation on the meaning of the above

P.T.O.

6

four verses paramatma is attained (8).

तत्र = ज्ञानक्रियो मध्ये — तत्र प्रथम ज्ञानस्य स्वतःसिद्धत्वं साधयति "अहं" इति

अहं जानामि = मैं जानता हूँ (वर्तमान कालमें) - प्रकाशे नीलादिरूपे यः अहं परामर्शः

मया ज्ञात = मैं ने जाना था (इस तरह तीनों काल पकड़नेसे)

ज्ञास्यते च = जानोंगा (इस भविष्य काल)

इत्येवं = अनेन ~~काम~~ प्रकारेण

तत्र अहं इति मया इति — अहं परामर्शः

स्वप्रकाशः = प्रकाशविषयत्वेन तद्वत् स्वग्रहणे परानुपेक्षः

योऽहं परामर्शः = तद् विषय इवाहमिति आन्तरो विमर्शः

तत्र परिनिष्ठतम् = भित्तौ इव चित्र लग्नम्, तेनैव लब्ध सत्तात्मकम् ॥

Standing on अहं परामर्शः which is स्वप्रकाशः Self illuminant.

इदं ज्ञानं नाम = ज्ञानाख्यं वस्तु भवति, न तु पृथग्लब्धसत्ताकं तथा च अहं ~~परामर्श~~ परामर्शवत् स्वप्रकाशत्वमपि भवति — स्वतः सिद्धत्वमस्य स्फुटमेव भावः। कथम्? अहं जानामि, मया ज्ञातं ज्ञास्यते च इत्येवं प्रकारेण।

किं तत्र अन्यत्र विचार्यते = अहं विमर्श निष्ठस्य ज्ञानस्य स्वतःसिद्धत्वे किमपि वक्तव्यं ॥

तद्प्रकाशे हि = तस्य अहंविमर्शविष्ठ ज्ञानस्य अप्रकाशे

विश्वम् = सर्वो भाव वर्गः

अन्धतमसम् = घनान्धकार रूपम्, ग्रहीतुमशक्यत्वात्

तदपि वा न स्यात = तमोग्रहणेऽपि च प्रकाशस्यैव सामर्थ्यात् न हि नेत्र द्वारेणासंचरित प्रकाशः जात्यान्धस्तमोऽपि ग्रहीतुमशकनोति ॥

बालोऽपि = अल्प बुद्धि वाला भी, बच्चा भी ·

प्रकाशविश्रान्तिमेव = अहं विमर्शस्य तन्निष्ठस्य ज्ञानस्य च सारतया स्थिते अहं प्रकाशे

संवेदयते = परेष्वनुभवविषयतां नयति

तदुक्तम् :-

स वेत्ति सर्वं न च तस्यास्ति वेत्ता इति श्रुति॥

(ते) विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयात् ॥

अरे = लोकाः प्रेक्षापूर्वकारिणः

~~तं~~ = अहं परामर्शनिष्ठज्ञानात् हि प्रमाता विज्ञाता॥

केन = केन प्रमाणेन, केनरूपेण

जानीयात् = तत एव लब्धसिद्धेः प्रमाणस्य तत्र व्यापारायोगात्

नीरूपस्य तस्य ज्ञाने न संभवत्येवेत्यर्थः

केन रूपेण स्वयं स्थित्वा तं जानीयात् - स्वयमेव तद्रूपेण स्थितत्वात् न तं ज्ञातुं शक्नोति - व्यतिरिक्तस्यैव ज्ञानविषयत्व संभवाद् इति अर्थः।

तन्निह्नवे = तस्य विज्ञातुरपलापे

ननु अहं विमर्शनिष्ठत्वद्वारेण ज्ञानस्य प्रकाशरूपं स्वतः सिद्धत्वं भवतु, क्रियाया - तत्कथं संभवेद - आह "तत्र च" — जानामीत्यत्र: । उपलक्षणं चैतत — इति वचनमात्रेणैव इति शेषः॥

संरम्भयोगोऽपि भाति = कृत प्रत्यय ... स्पन्दयोगेऽपि, अहं परामर्शनिष्ठज्ञानवत् स्वप्रकाशत्वेन स्फुरति॥

अपलाप = जानकारी से मुकर जाना, टालमटोल Kashmiri "Yale thegun"

concealment / observation

Without the Subject the objective world is nowhere

"जानामीत्यादि" द्वारा

The Subject with his quality of Self shining "प्रकाशमयता"

133

संरम्भेन ← येन = भानेन   जानामीति वपुः = प्रकृति प्रत्यय-

जाना जाने के कारण वह जड है ← विभागकल्पनया ज्ञानक्रियानिष्ठं जानामीति अस्य स्वरूपम् ।

अत्यन्तजडात् = स्वग्रहणे सर्वदा परापेक्षत्वात् अतिशयेन

शुक्लादेर्गुणात् = जैसे शुक्लादि गुण होते हैं जडात्
वह गुण स्वयम् "जानामि" विमर्शन शक्ति हीन हैं ॥ यह जडगुण "जानामि" ("मैं जानता हूं") से ही जाने जाते हैं ॥

चित रूपता प्राप्त कर के - उस के साथ एकी भाव / एकीभाव बन कर के "मैं" के साथ प्राप्त कर के (मैं जानता हूं) एक बन कर के) See stir Unruhe S. 955 L 105 वह ही संरम्भ हरकत स्पन्द है यह आन्तरिक स्पन्द ही विमर्श है" यह ही आन्तरिक "क्रिया" है।

चित् स्वभावताम् = चिद्रूपताम् अभ्येति = प्राप्नोति

आन्तरं प्रमातृरूपं ज्ञाने प्रति ग्राह्यत्वेऽपि बाह्यं शुक्लादिगुणं प्रति प्रमाणभावम् आसाद्य ग्राहकत्वात् -

स च संरम्भो विमर्शः = अन्तः संरम्भविमर्शरूपः चमत्कारः योगः संबन्धः ॥

विमर्शः = विषयावसायरूपः

"घटादिग्रहकालेऽपि घटं जानाति सा क्रिया" ।

घटादिग्रहणकालेऽपि यद् घटं जानातीति भवति सा क्रिया भवति, न तु करणकालिकं करोमीत्येतदेव क्रिया भवति इति अपि शब्द अभिप्रायः

"मैं" से चलकर "जानता हूं" तक जो "movement" स्पन्द "motionless stir" है वह "क्रिया" भगवती का "सूक्ष्मातिसूक्ष्म" "शरीर" - "रूप" है।

आन्तरी - प्रमाणरूपा न तु कायव्यापाररूपा

सैव = आन्तरी क्रियैव   स्वशक्त्या = निजसामर्थ्येन (स्वेच्छया)

व्यापारात्मिका = व्यापाररूपा   मायापदे = भेदे

विषयः = गोचरः

स्पन्दनरूपा = चेष्टारूपकथनरूपा

That very inherent power of ... enters into body ... nature ... because of its inherent power, enters and being of shining directly perceptible ... as physical bodies ... vital air and the "group of 8" and ... action in the sphere of ...

साहित्येन = सहचरत्वेन स्व स्वभाव = उपादानत्वेन (the real cause) निजस्वरूपं

अहंतात्मकम्॥ ← अवगमयति = भावितव्यम् इति

अवगमविषयतां नयति

स्वसंवेदवैव स्वप्रकाशं ज्ञानं एतेन ज्ञानस्य परासिद्धत्वमपि

परप्रकाशरूपेण — कथितम्॥

अन्हतारूपेण॥

The Light of consciousness does not shine as "this". ज्ञानम् = विज्ञातरूपम्. इदन्तया = इदमिति बुद्ध्या

विज्ञातृरूपम् ← न च भाति — अहंनिष्ठत्वेनैव तस्य समनन्तर साधनात्

इदन्ता हि अज्ञानत्वं = ज्ञानव्यतिरिक्तेषु घटादिष्वेव

For "thisness" is negation of knowledge. तत्प्रयोगात्

And a thing that is cognised as something else cannot be said to be truly cognised. (न च) अन्यद्वस्तु अन्येन वपुषा स्वरूपेण — भातं

भातं न भवेत्, अन्यथा रजतभावेन भाताया:

शुक्तेः अपि भातत्वप्रसंगात्॥

→ भातं भातं भवेत् = भारूपं भातं भवेत्॥

तत्र ज्ञानं भात्येव परं = केवलम् तत्र रजत्

ज्ञानमेव भवति एव

केवलं पूर्ण ज्ञानस्वरूपम् ← भात्येव = यथा तथा कल्पिते तदभावेपि साक्षितया

स्थितत्वात्, अन्यथाऽभानासिद्धेः —

ननु सदा भानेन तस्य किमायातम् इत्यत आह — "भाति च"

इति यत् च भाति तत्

अहमित्यस्य = अहंपदवाच्यस्य विज्ञातुः वपुः —

स्वरूपं भाति

चित्रूप वपुः

परज्ञानमपि = परकायाश्रितम्

स्वात्मनः तनु वेद्यतेव ← स्वात्मैव भवति परस्मिन् सदा भानात्

......शिवादि सकलान्त : स च सर्वेश एव, भेदावभासस्तु तत्स्वातन्त्र्य प्रदत्तैव ॥

परत्वं केवलम् ....

स च = उपाधिश्च   विचारित : - विचारित एव सन् ॥

अन्य : — प्रकाशरूप प्रमातृव्यतिरिक्तो न भवति

विश्व : सर्व :   परमार्थत: एक : प्रमाता भवति, मध्ये स्थितस्योपाधेरपि तद्भावेन स्फुरणात्

प्रमातृवर्ग : = संकुचित् जीव वर्ग:

स च एव च = एक : प्रमाता एव   अस्ति = परमार्थ: सन्भवति

स्वपरात्मनि = स्वेनरूपेण परेण रूपेण च ॥

प्रमातृभेदस्योपाधिकल्पितत्वेन परमार्थेन असत्त्वात् ॥

घट : = वेदनविषयभूतो घट :

मदात्मना = वेदकरूपस्य मम स्वरूपेण

वेत्ति = स्वविषयं वेदनं प्रति कर्तृत्वं भजति

इति नयेन वेदनेच्छाकाले मद्भावेन स्फुरणात् अहं च घटात्मना वेद्मि — मद्भावासादनप्राप्तवेदकभाव घटस्वरूपेण चाहं वेद्मि - ममापि घटग्रहणकाले घटभावासादनात् अन्यथा ग्रहणासद्भावात् -

ऊह्यते = संभाव्यते तर्क्यते

वदेवं सति —   न वृत्त: = न संपन्न:

संवेदनपथे = ज्ञान मार्गे

तत्रैव = ईश्वररूपे परात्मन्येव

आत्मनि तदैकात्म्यमापादयन्त: — निमज्जयन्त : = अन्तर्भावयन्त :, तद्भावेनैव पश्यन्त इति या:

ईश्वरसमाविष्टा = प्राप्तेश्वर प्रतिभिज्ञा :

सम्यक जीवन्मुक्ता एवा — भवन्ति = इत्येन समावेशस्य सिद्धत्वमेव कथयति ॥

निमज्जनेन हि प्राप्तेषु तेषु यथोचितं भोग: ॥

टंकः = पाषाणदारणः

ईश्वर प्रत्यभिज्ञलक्षणम् = ईश्वरोऽहमिति प्रत्यभिज्ञा-रूपः

एतावदेव = आत्मनि उत्कर्षविश्रामणमेव।

अवितथम् = संक्षेपेण इत्यर्थः

प्रमेय विषयः — प्रत्यभिज्ञा विषयः

गत्यर्थत्वात् = गत्यर्था ज्ञानार्था इति नीतेरित्यर्थः

येन = सर्वे गत्यर्थाः ज्ञानार्थाः इति वैयाकरणरीत्या॥

प्रमेयम् = स एव ईश्वरोऽहमिति एवं रूपं

गतिम् = गमनरूपम्।

स्त्रियं गच्छति = स्त्रियं गच्छति इति स्थाने एव स्त्रियं हन्तीति प्रयोजनम्।

हन्यते = अपसार्यते

प्रमेयविषयो ...... = अत्र प्रमेय पदस्य — विषयार्थता ज्ञेया तेन प्रमेयस्य, ईश्वरोऽहमिति विषयस्य यः विषयो गोचरो व्यामोहः स येन हन्यते इति संबन्धः॥

II āhnika.

The ultimate Reality, conceived by this system, is made quite clear if the opposite views are first postulated and then refuted. As Bata Narayana has said

"Homage to the Deity, which at first creates the illusion for those who are deluded in the world & then dispels it and which at first conceals the unitary bliss of pure Self-consciousness & then reveals it".

Here the Author, wishing to reveal the Reality after having dispelled the illusion of those who deny both the Self & God, presents the illusion in eleven verses, begining with ननु स्वलक्षणा.... & ending in तेन कर्तास्ति..... In the 1st 2 verses the position of those who maintain the inferability of the Self is refuted, on the ground that unification of experiences involved in remembrances, can be explained in terms of the residual traces & therefore is not sufficient for the inference of the Self. In the next one, the inference, that through the qualities, like knowledge etc, the substratum can be inferred, is refuted. Having thus refuted the Self, the next 2 verses make it

P.T.O

~~In this system, Saktisattva means "Surrender" consisting in the dedication of the~~

clear that the Conception of "Knowledge" as distinct from Self, as held by the opponent (Visheshaka) as well as the Sankhyas conception of it, do not stand to reason. This is done only to refute the view that the ultimate is Omnipotent & Omniscient, because of the possession of powers of knowledge & action. In the next one, it is declared that action as such has no external existence anywhere. Having refuted the argument in support of it, he states the argument against it. Then in the next verse he denies the existence of relation on the ground that there is no proof in support of it. Then in the next verse he gives the argument against it. The last verse states the Buddhist theory that there is no eternal Self nor are knowledge & action its characteristics. This is the summary of the prima facie view:—

Now the meaning of the text is being explained

पूर्वपक्षतया येन विश्वमाभास्य भेदतः
अभेदोत्तरपक्षान्तनीयते तं स्तुमः शिवम् ॥

"We bow to that Śiva who, having manifested the diversity of the universe as the prima-facie view, leads it up to unity, the real view.

विश्वम = षट्त्रिंशत्तत्त्वात्मकं जगत् पूर्वपक्षतया = प्रतिसमाधेय-पूर्वपक्षभावेन,

भेदतः आभास्य = निजेच्छया भेदतः — इदन्ताग्रहण प्राण भेदेन, आभासविषयतां नीत्वा ।

अभेद एव = अहन्ता प्राणा एकता एव उत्तरपक्षः — स्थापनीयः पक्षः

स एवान्तः = अवसाने तम्, नीयते = प्राप्यते ॥

वयं तं शिवं स्तुमः = स्वोत्कृष्टतया भावयामः ।

इह = अस्मिन् शास्त्रमार्गे परमार्थरूपम् = तात्पर्यविषयत्वेन परमाभिधेयरूपम् ।

आशंक्यमाना = वादिभिः शंकितुमारब्धा, न तु संभवसहाः

ये प्रतिपक्षाः — विरुद्धाः अपरमार्थभूताः प्रतिद्वन्द्विनः पक्षाः

तेषां यत् प्रतिक्षेपणम् = प्रतिसमाधानं तेन

नमः = अस्मत्कृतिकः प्रह्वीभावोऽस्तु

कीदृशाय भवते? — भवे = रागद्वेषमये संसारे"

ये संभ्रान्ताः = विस्मृतस्वात्मत्वेन देहादावात्मभ्रमयुक्ता ये जीवाः,

तेषां भ्रान्तिम् = प्रोक्तरूपं भ्रमम्,

तत् उद्भाव्य = प्रकटीकृत्य भिन्दते = तीव्रतरशक्तिपातेन पुनः विदारकाय

अत एव ज्ञानानन्दम् = आत्मप्रकाशरूपमानन्दम् ॥

कीदृशम् ? निर्द्वन्द्वम् = विषय सुख दुःख रूप द्वन्द्व व्यतिरिक्तम्

वृत्वा = माया द्वारा ज्ञान्यावरण विषयतां नीत्वा,

विवृण्वते = तदपसारणेन प्रकटीकुर्वते ॥

एतेन मध्ये विस्मृतं वस्तु पुनः प्राप्तम् अतिशयेन आनन्दकारी भवति इति भ्रान्त्या उत्थापनं अपि कृपाहेतुकम् एव इति द्योतितम् ॥

तत्र हि = इस आह्निक में

अनात्मानीश्वरवादिनां = जो अनात्म में अनीश्वरवादी हैं

भेदन पूर्वक = उस को उडाने के लिए भ्रान्ति = जो उन की भ्रान्ती है

परमार्थं = फिर जो कुछ परमार्थ है

विवरीष्यन = उसी को प्रकट करने की इच्छा से

तत उद्भावनं = उस भ्रान्ति का पहिले प्रकट करना कि वह क्या कहते हैं

तावत् एकादशभिः श्लोकैः करोति = इन ग्यारह श्लोकों से किया जाता है ॥

तत्र = इन ग्यारह श्लोकों में

श्लोक द्वयेन = पहिले और दूसरे श्लोक से

आत्मनो = आत्मा जो है

ध्रुवस्य = जिस को वह आत्मवादी नित्य समझते हैं

"दृश्य" — दृश्यस्य - सत्त्वे द्रष्टुं योग्यस्य,

या अनुपलब्धि = अप्राप्तिः — तथा प्राणभृतया,

अभाव उक्तः = अनुपलब्धस्यापि पक्षस्य स्वरूपविप्रकर्षे अभाव साधनं न उचितम् इति ॥

प्रत्यक्षात्मवादिनः प्रति = शैवान प्रति, त एव हि नित्यम आत्मानं प्रत्यक्षं वदन्ति ॥

तत्र श्लोक त्रयेण = तीसरे, चौथे और पांचवे श्लोक से

स्मृत्यनुसंधानेन आत्मसद्भावः अनुमीयते ॥

← स्मृत्य ..... सिद्धम् = जो कहते हैं स्मृता जो है वह आत्मा है

← अन्यथासिद्धत्वात् = यदि स्मृत्य न हो तो स्मृत्य, अनुसंधान से की सिद्धि नहीं हो सकती है

आत्मानुमानाय न पर्याप्तम् = लेकिन यह सारा कुछ अनुमान है और अनुमान की व्याप्ति आत्मा पर नहीं हो सकती ।। (आत्मनि विना)

यह अनुमान वादियों पर कहा गया है – वह कहते हैं कि आत्मा की सिद्धि अनुमान से हो सकती है।।

तत्र श्लोकेन = छठे श्लोक से

ज्ञानादि ----- = वह कहते है ज्ञानादि गुण जो हैं उन से गुणी (जिसके यह गुण हैं) जाना जा सकता है

ज्ञान क्रिया शक्ति संबन्ध रूपमैश्वर्यं = ज्ञान क्रिया संबन्धात् ज्ञातृ कर्तृत्व रूपं

ज्ञानस्य स्वरूपमेव .... = भिन्न भिन्न वादियों ने ज्ञान के स्वरूप को ही आत्मा कहा है ।।

सांख्यमते च अयुज्यमानम = सांख्यों ने कहा है कि ज्ञान का आत्मा के साथ कोई संबन्ध नहीं है ।।

ततः एकेन = नवें श्लोक से

न काचिदपि = न स्वस्वरूपेण   कुचिदपि = न किंचित् आधारम्

स तत्र = इस ज्ञान क्रिया के संबन्ध पर

साधकम् = सिद्ध करने वाला प्रमाण (मृत्ती सती घट सत्ती)

प्रतिक्षिप्य = निरास्य

बाधकं च = बाधक प्रमाण भी (मिट्टी नहीं तो घट भी नहीं)

उपन्यासः = Placing near to, to suggest.
Having stated – ठहरा कर.

श्लोकेन = दसवें श्लोक से   संबन्धस्य = ज्ञान क्रियादेः

प्रतिपादितं = न अस्तित्वं बाधक प्रमाण से सिद्ध किया ॥

प्रमाण अभावे वदता = जो भाव सिद्ध करना है उस पर कोई प्रमाण नहीं है यह कहा गया

श्लोकेण = ग्यारवें श्लोक से ← तत्र = स्थिरे आत्मनि

The Buddhist Saugata refutes the view of Shaivatma-vadin that there exists a permanent Subject (Self).

ननु स्वलक्षणाभासं ज्ञानमेकं परं पुनः ।
साभिलापं विकल्पाख्यं बहुधा नापि तद्द्वयम् ॥१॥
नित्यस्य कस्यचिद् द्रष्टुस्तस्यात्रानवभासतः ।
अहं प्रतीतिरप्येषा शरीराद्यवसायिनी ॥२॥

योजना :-

ननु स्वलक्षण-आभासं ज्ञानम् (निर्विकल्पकम्) एकम्, पुनः परम् (the other अन्यत्) साभिलापं (शब्दन रूपेण सह वर्तते). विकल्पाख्यम् (सविकल्पकम्) बहुधा (स्मृति संशयोत्प्रेक्षादि बहुभेदं), तत द्वयम् अपि नित्यस्य कस्यचिद् द्रष्टुः न (भवतः), तस्य अत्र अनवभासतः, एषा अहं प्रतीतिः अपि शरीरादि अवसायनी (भवति) ॥

Eng Trans :-

(There are only two kinds of Cognitions), one is indeterminate Cognition, which manifests itself in its essential nature only & स्वलक्षणाभासं ज्ञानम् characterised by the limitations of time, space form. It is one (एकम्) i.e. has no variety. The other (परम्) is the determinate Cognition which admits of linguistic expression. It is of many

kinds such as remembrance, doubt, imagination etc. Neither of these two ~~kin~~ cognitions belongs to a permanent perceiver (Self) because none such is experienced. As regards the I-Consciousness (अहं प्रतीति) which persist in different experiences such as "I am there", "I am happy" & so on, it has reference only to (cognitions pertaining to) the body (~~or mind~~) etc.

(Saugata says, it is not right to say that there exists a permanent Self-luminous Self. There are only the chains of indeterminate determinate cognitions, but there is no substratum of the cognitions; nor any permanent being as cognizer apart from the fleeting cognitions)

अनवभासतः = बोधत्रय मध्ये अदर्शनात् ॥

अवसायिनी = अवसायरूपं विकल्पविषयां

कोऽसौ स्थिरः आत्मा साभिलापाऽहं प्रत्ययेनाऽपि

शरीरादि वेद्यवस्तु, उत्तीर्णा न वेदयिता ॥

Page 53.

Karika 1-2.

"ननु" means objection. It has been stated that the Self which is essentially Consciousness, is permanent. But it is not right. For, such an Self-luminous or permanent Self is not experienced. It is as follows:-

ज्ञान: alone shines, associated with different times, objects and forms, such as indeterminate cognition of jar, determinate cognition of it, recognition of it, remembrance of it etc. Indeterminate knowledge of 'blue' is that ~~is that~~ in which the characteristic of the object of knowledge are cognised as common to nothing else (स्वलक्षणाभास ज्ञानम्). 'स्व' means not applicable to others, i.e. self-confined. "लक्षणा" consists of limitations of time, space & form. 'उन्मुखता' means light of the object facing the ~~object~~ subject. Thus ~~indir~~ indeterminate knowledge is that extrovert-light of consciousness, wherein 'स्वलक्षणा' as ~~dead~~ defined above, shines. Its essential nature does not change inspite of the changes in the object. For, there is no cause to bring about any variety in its nature ~~Cause of Variety~~; but that is absent here. For, expression is not the attribute of the object, the "blue"; nor is it perceived

P.T.O.

by the eye. Therefore, it is some thing which was known before and is to be remembered now. In the absence of the revival of the Sanskāra, there is no remembrance. The revival is due to determinate perception of the object. Therefore, at the time of the indeterminate perception of object there is no remembrance of expression.

Determinate knowledge is different from it. For, all determinate knowledge springs from the indese indeterminate directly or indirectly. The word 'TR' means 'of a different nature'. The object of determinate knowledge is a thing which is characterised by a universal. "Svalakhna" is extremly self-confined. Hence there is no possibility of the use of conventional expression in regard to indeterminate cognition, because whether it be acquired through the observations of transactions of the elders or through teaching, it involves elaborate determinate knowledge. Even if it be used, it would serve no useful purpose, because it cannot be applied to another object and therefore cannot be used in practical life.

Determinate knowledge is of many kinds,

Contd on page 3.

Continued from page 3:

In this para which ~~is indeterminate~~ [illegible] means

because it is invariably associated with expression which is nothing more than inner speech. Expression is of many kinds: 'this, that, that is this, it may be this, this or this etc". It (the expression) does not belong to the object; on the contrary, it gives variety of forms to cognition. Hence determinate knowledge is of various kinds. Thus, the chain of indeterminate & determinate cognition is self-shining.

It may be so. But the view that the substratum of these cognitions is also self-shining is not sound, because both these types of cognition, the determinate & the indeterminate are not related to any cogniser different from themselves. If we accept the theory of existence of the external object, they may be spoken of as related to the perceptible. This reason is this:–

The cogniser is admitted to be essentially of the nature of consciousness. This implies that it is self-shining. As such it should be cognisable. But there is no consciousness of it in either of these two types of cognition. It cannot be maintained that this negative reasoning is invalid, because the self does shine, as in the following:– "I know, I am certain, I remember this". In all these forms of cognitions the persisting "I" shines

P.T.O.

Contd on page 4.

as persisting through all of them. It is distinct from the direct apprehension and remembrance etc which represent the meanings of the roots "Vid" etc, as also from the thing which is the object of cognitive activity such as "this". Who says it shines? For, "to shine" is indeterminacy, but the Self-consciousness is a form of determinate knowledge, because it is associated with the expression "I". Even, then it may be asked, What does this word "I" determine"? Does it determine the chain of physical consciousness, because the "I-consciousness" is associated with it, as in "I am thin" or does it determine the chain of feelings, because of the experiences, "I am happy" etc? For, the possessive affix refers to the chain only and nothing else outside. This has been asserted (in karika) "Even the Self Consciousness refers to body". By the word आदि feeling is implied. Surely the "I" determines body etc as a chain, because "I-consciousness" is affected by the residual traces, due to past experiences of the different similar moments in the chain. "This" (इदं) means that which is not denied by others, because it is implied in the statement;— "Determinate knowledge is associated with expressions". The "I-consciousness itself is not the Self, because it is a determinate cognition and it is transitory in its nature. There is nothing different from body etc, which is referred to by this "I-consciousness". And even there be, it would be objective in its nature. Thus no Self, different from cognition and the object thereof is established. (1-2).

"नु" means objection. ← आक्षेपे = अभियोगे, न तु प्रश्ने तस्य इह अयुक्तताद्

संवित्स्वभावः = essentially consciousness

स्थिरः = Permanent.

नावत् अयुक्तता = is not experienced.

कहे हुए कि सिद्धांत को निरास करते हुए कुछ कहना आक्षेप कहलाता है। इसलिए तुम जो कहते हो वह गलत है॥

(उक्तस्य सिद्धान्तस्य निराकरणमाक्षेपः ॥ ज्ञानक्रियाशक्तिमत्त्वं संवित्स्वभावत्वम्॥).

अप्रकाशनात् = अनावभासनात् — is not experienced

तथाहि = दृश्यतां किल इति अर्थः 'ghar' ज्ञानः

(1) घट प्रकाशः = घट विषयं निर्विकल्पज्ञानम् alone shine (indeterminate)

as determinate cognition (2) विकल्पः = सविकल्प ज्ञानम, (3) घटप्रत्यभिज्ञा = सोयमित्युभयजं ज्ञानम — Recognition

(4) घटस्मृति = स इति संस्कारजं ज्ञानम्॥ Remembrance

(5) घट उत्प्रेक्षा = भवितव्यमिति तर्कज्ञानम् — Argument

आदि — शब्देन इदं वा इदं वा इति (6) संशय ज्ञानं गृह्यते

outgoing of this or that or doubtful knowledge

ज्ञानान्येव = इदमिति बाह्यसंमुख्ये प्रमाण रूप

प्रकाशन्ते = स्वप्रकाशतया स्फुरन्ति only knowledge is shining.

भिन्नकालानि भिन्न ...... = एक घटविषयत्वेऽपि कल्पितं भेदमपेक्ष्य,

निर्विकल्प ज्ञानम् → तत्र = ज्ञान षट्कमध्ये, (निर्विकल्प और सविकल्प मध्ये).

नीलस्य प्रकाशः स्वलक्षणाभासं ज्ञानम = भवतीति संबन्ध विशेषैक विषयं स्वस्वरूपैव विषयं

which as has common "स्वम" — आत्मीयम्

to nothing else or not applicable to others. ← अन्यानुयायि = दूसरे के पीछे न चलने वाला, न किसी दूसरे के जैसा — independent of anything else

Consists of limitation of time, space + form. स्वरूप संकोच भागि = स्वरूपे संकोचं भजतीति तादृशम्

लक्षणे" — स्वरूपम् - तत्र च देशादि योजानामयम्

तस्य = स्वलक्षण - अर्थस्य यस्य = देशादेः

प्रकाशनम् = प्रकाशः

Light of object facing the subject. ← आभासः — निर्विकल्प ज्ञानः — क्षणिकान्येव ज्ञानानि प्रकाशन्ते न तु ज्ञानी (आत्माऽपर पर्यायः कश्चित्)

अन्तर्मुखम् = प्रमातृसांमुख्येन, प्रतिबिम्बतया

बहिर्मुखीनस्वरूपधारिणि = मेय-उपराग बाह्येन्द्रियजन्ये, इदमिति बाह्य संमुख्ये प्रमाण रूपे ॥

ज्ञाने = ज्ञानपद वाच्ये वस्तुनि । एतेन "स्वलक्षण"- इत्यस्य ज्ञान विशेषणत्वम् उक्तं.

तत् अविकल्पकं — समनन्तर उक्तं प्रकाशरूपं विकल्पज्ञानं

वैचित्र्यकारणम् = विविधत्व-कल्पने

विषयभेदेऽपि = घटादि विषय भेदेऽपि सति, Its nature does not change inspite of the changes in the object.

एक जातीयम् — एक रूपं भवति

संजल्पः ← अभिलापः = शब्दनम्

अत्र = निर्विकल्प ज्ञाने

परामर्श: अन्तर्वाक्-लक्षणः

"न हि" — नील धर्मित्वे तस्य संस्कारापेक्षा न स्यात् इति भावः For, expression is not the attribution of the object "blue"

चक्षुर्ग्राह्यः = अभिलापस्य श्रावणत्वात् " ← not is the "blue" perceived by the eye-

असौ = यह It is Something which was known before so it be remembered now.

प्राच्यः = संकेत कालीनः

अभिलापः वृद्धदत्त संकेतः

स्मर्तव्यः = स्मृति के योग्य,

घटादि वस्तु संस्कार-

अप्रबुद्धे ← = जब संस्कार न जागे, In the absence of revival of Sanskara there is no remembrance.

स्य प्रबोधः तेन च स्मृति।

तत् प्रबोधः = संस्कार प्रबोधः The revival is due to direct perception of the object.

वस्तुदर्शनोत्थितः = विषयभूतस्य घटादे तत उत्थितः

दर्शनम् = प्रकाशः

ततः = तस्मात् ज्ञानात्

वस्तुदर्शनसमये ---- = At the time of indeterminate perception of object there is no × remembrance or expression

परम् = अन्यरूपेण विकल्प ज्ञानम् प्रादुर्भवति इति शेषः

अत्र हेतुमाह "सर्वस्य" इति ....

For, all determinate knowledge springs from indeterminate directly or indirectly.

तत्र घटविकल्पस्य साक्षात् निर्विकल्प ज्ञान मूलत्वम्, मणि प्रभा दर्शनोत्थस्य मणिविकल्पस्य पारम्पर्येण मणि प्रभादर्शनोत्थत्वम्, प्रभा हि प्रभा दर्शनं तेन प्रभाविकल्पः तेन मणिविकल्पः ॥

"परम" इति → कुतो अस्य अन्यत्वम् (of diff. nature) इति अपेक्षायाम् आह
"सामान्य" इति, यत इति शेषः characterised by a universal.
सामान्यलक्षणम् – सामान्यस्वरूपम् तस्य = सविकल्पस्य
अत एव परत्वम् इति भावः
यद्यपि सिद्धान्ते निर्विकल्पस्य सामान्यनिष्ठत्वं
सविकल्पस्य तु देशादियोजनारूपविशेषनिष्ठत्वमेव
तथापि तावत् एतत् आस्ताम् ॥

'स्वलक्षण' is extremely confined.

ननु स्वलक्षणं कथं न विषयो अस्य भवति इत्यत आह: "स्वलक्षणे" इति
वृद्धव्यावहारिकस्य = देवदत्त गामानयेत्यादि वृद्धव्यवहार मूलस्य
अपदेशकस्य = "अयं गौः" इति शृंगग्राहिकया कृतस्य
अशक्यत्वात् – स्वलक्षणानि इति भावः
ननु प्रयत्नेन संकेतं करिष्याम एवेत्यत आह "कृतस्यापि" इति
कुतोऽस्य वैयर्थ्यम् इति अर्थः
पुनः = अन्यस्वरूप ग्रहणकाले, स्वरूपाणां भिन्नत्वात्,
अन्यथा स्वरूपत्वाऽयोगाद् इति भावः
तत् च = विकल्पे च, कुतस्तदीदृशमित्यपेक्षायां हेतु
आह "साभिलापम्"
यतः इति – स्मृतिविषयेण इति शेषः। शब्दनस्य स्वरूपं
बहुधात्वं – "इदम्" इति सविकल्प ज्ञान परामर्शः
"तत्" इति स्मृति ज्ञानस्य "तदिदम्" = प्रत्यभिज्ञायाः
"भवेदिदम्" = तर्कस्य "इदं वा इदं" – संशयस्य.

There is no possibility of the use of conventional expression in regard to undeterminate cognition; whether it be acquired through the observation of transactions of elders or through teachings; it involves elaborate determinate knowledge. Even if it be used, it would serve no purpose.

विकल्पस्य = विकल्प ज्ञानस्य
"यन्निष्ठा" = यस्मिन्नहं विषये स्वात्मनि निष्ठां गता, 'अहं जानामि' इति तदुदयात् इति भावः
अविकल्पेतररूपम् – अविकल्प सविकल्परूपम्
एतद्व्यतिरिक्तस्य = प्रोक्त ज्ञानद्वय भिन्नस्य
न अन्यस्य = नित्यस्य, द्रष्टुः
दृश्यस्य = दृश्यतया स्थितस्य देहादेरित्यर्थः

It may be so. But the view that the substratum of these cognitions is also self shining is not sound.

अन्तर्मुखम् = प्रमातृसांमुख्येन, प्रतिबिम्बतया

बहिर्मुखीनस्वरूपधारिणि = मेय-उपराग बाह्येन्द्रियजन्ये, इदमिति बाह्य संमुख्ये प्रमाण रूपं ॥

ज्ञाने = ज्ञानपद वाच्ये वस्तुनि । एतेन "स्वलक्षण" - इत्यस्य ज्ञान विशेषणत्वम् उक्तं.

तत् अविकल्पकं — समनन्तर उक्तं प्रकाशरूपं विकल्प ज्ञानम्

वैचित्र्यकारणम् = विषयभेदेऽपि = घटादि विषय भेदेऽपि सति, Its nature does not change inspite of the changes in the object.

विविधत्व-कल्पने

एक जातीयम् — एक रूपं भवति

संजल्पः ← अभिलापः = शब्दनम् अत्र = निर्विकल्प ज्ञाने

पदान्तर[illegible] लक्षणः

"न हि" - नील धर्मित्वे तस्य संस्कारापेक्षा न स्यात इति भावः For, expression is not the attribution of the object "Blue"

← चक्षुर्ग्राह्यः = अभिलापस्य श्रावणत्वात् ॥ before it to be

not is the "blue" perceived by the eye - असौ → = यत् It is something which was known remembered now प्राक् = संकेत कालीन:

स्मर्तव्यः = स्मृत्य के योग्य, अभिलापः वृद्धदत्त संकेतः

In the absence of revival of Sanskara there is no remembrance. ← अप्रबुद्ध = जब संस्कार न जागे, घटादि वस्तु संस्कारस्य प्रबोधः तेन च स्मृत्य ।

तत् प्रबोधः = संस्कार प्रबोधः The revival is due to direct perception of the object.

वस्तुदर्शनोत्थितः = विषय भूतस्य घटादि [illegible]

ततः = तस्मात् ज्ञानात् दर्शनम् = प्रकाशः तत उत्थितः

वस्तुदर्शनसमये ---- = At the time of indeterminate perception of object there is no remembrance or expression

परम् = अन्य रूपेण विकल्प ज्ञानम् प्रादुर्भवति इति शेषः

अत्र हेतुमाह "सर्वस्य" इति ....

For, all determinate knowledge springs from indeterminate directly or indirectly

तत्र घटविकल्पस्य साक्षात् निर्विकल्प ज्ञान मूलत्वम्, मणि प्रभा दर्शनोत्थस्य मणिविकल्पस्य पारम्पर्येण मणि प्रभादर्शनोत्थत्वम्, प्रभा हि प्रभा दर्शनं तेन प्रभा विकल्पः तेन मणि विकल्पः ॥

of diff. nature.

"परम" इति → कुतो अस्य अन्यत्वम् इति अपेक्षायाम् आह

"सामान्य" इति, यत इति शेषः characterised by a universal.

सामान्यलक्षणम् – सामान्यस्वरूपम्   तस्य = सविकल्पस्य

अत एव परत्वम् इति भावः

यद्यपि सिद्धान्ते निर्विकल्पस्य सामान्यनिष्ठत्वं
सविकल्पस्य तु देशादियोजनारूपविशेषनिष्ठत्वमेव
तथापि तावत् एतत् आस्ताम् ॥

'स्वलक्षण' is extremely confined.

ननु स्वलक्षणे कथं न विषयो अस्य भवति इत्याह : "स्वलक्षणे" इति

वृद्धव्यावहारिकस्य = देवदत्त गामानयेत्यादि वृद्धव्यवहारमूलस्य

औपदेशिकस्य = "अयं गौः" इति शृंगग्राहिकया कृतस्य

अशक्यत्वात् – स्वलक्षणानि इति भावः

ननु प्रयत्नेन संकेतं करिष्याम एवेत्यत आह "कृतस्यापि" इति

कुतोऽस्य वैयर्थ्यम् इति अर्थः

पुनः = अन्यस्वरूपग्रहणकाले, स्वरूपाणां भिन्नत्वात्,

अन्यथा स्वरूपत्वायोगाद् इति भावः

तत् च = विकल्पे च, कुतस्तदीदृशमित्यपेक्षायां हेतु

आह "साभिलापम्"

यतः इति – स्मृतिविषयेण इति शेषः। शब्दनस्य स्वरूपं

बहुधात्वं – "इदम्" इति सविकल्पज्ञानपरामर्शः

There is no possibility of the use of conventional expression in regard to indeterminate cognition; whether it be acquired through the observation of transactions of elders or through teachings; it involves elaborate determinate knowledge. Even if it be used, it would serve no purpose.

"तत्" इति स्मृतिज्ञानस्य "तदिदम्" = प्रत्यभिज्ञायाः

"भवेदिदम्" = तर्कस्य "इदं वा इदं" – संशयस्य।

विकल्पस्य = विकल्पज्ञानस्य

"यन्निष्ठा" = यस्मिन्नहंविषये स्वात्मनि निष्ठां गता, 'अहं जानामि'

इति तदुदयात् इति भावः

अविकल्पेतररूपम् – अविकल्पसविकल्परूपम्

एतद्व्यतिरिक्तस्य = प्रोक्तज्ञानद्वयभिन्नस्य

न अन्यस्य = नित्यस्य, द्रष्टुः

दृश्यस्य = दृश्यतया स्थितस्य देहादेरित्यर्थः

It may be so. Point the view that the substratum of these cognitions is also self shining is not sound.

If we accept the theory of ex-ternal objects they may be spoken as related to the perceptible.

बाह्यार्थवादे = बाह्यार्थवादिसौत्रान्तिकमते, न तु विज्ञानशून्यवादे

मात्र = वित्त्यस्य द्रष्टुः संबन्धित्वाभावे

अत एव – द्रष्टुत्वात्, द्रष्टु हि संवित्स्वभावता प्राप्तिरुपयोपयोगिनी इति भावः

"स्वप्रकाश" इति, अवश्यं हि संवित्स्वभावस्य स्वप्रकाशताऽन्यथा जडतापातादिति भावः

आपन्न – स्वप्रकाशतायोगेन प्राप्ता, उपलब्धिलक्षण प्राप्ति = उपलब्धिप्रमाण प्राप्तिः येन तादृशस्य

The meaning of the root विद् is direct apprehension & remembrance & this 'I' is quite distinct from them though persisting through them in "I know", "I remember".

विदादि – इस धातु से (वेद्मि)

प्रकृत्यर्थरूपात् – प्रत्ययार्थस्य क्रियारूपत्वात्

कर्मरूपात् = कर्मकारकस्वरूपात्

अनुयायिनी = प्रयोगत्रयेऽपयहमोऽनुवर्तनात्

"क एव" – पूर्वपक्षवादी सकोपमाह

भान = Self consciousness.

ननु = सिद्धान्ती पुनः प्रष्टव्यति अनेन = शब्द-अनुविद्धेन विकल्पज्ञानेन

अनेन = अहं विमर्शेन → what does this "I" determine

because 'I' consciousness is affected by the residual traces, due to past experience of different similar moments in the chain.

"सदृश" इति, सदृशा ये अपरे भावभेदाः = क्षणरूपाः भावविशेषाः

तेषां यत् ग्रहणम् = पूर्वकालीनोऽनुभवः

तस्य सामर्थ्येन – वशेन या वासना – भावनारूपः संस्कारः

तया यत् आविष्टत्वम = आवेशाविषयीकृतत्वम्

तस्माद्, वासनयैव हि विकल्पोऽयं इति भावः

*- अहमिति शब्दसंस्पर्शो विकल्पप्रत्यय एवाभाति न तु वित्त्यात्मा ॥ अयं घटः, सोऽयं घटः, स घटः, घटेन भवितव्यम् – इत्यादिरूपो कश्चिदिह अन्यान्यभावः सदृशः स एव भेदः सदृशापरापरभावात्मा भेदः तस्य ग्रहणं विकल्पनं तत्सामर्थ्यं तदुत्त्वमेव वासना तया विशाहे → – अवश्यं विकल्पयत्येव। ततश्च किं निरूपणं ॥ प्रतीतिः –

"तथापि" इति, देहात्मवादी चार्वाकः विज्ञानवादी बौद्धश्च स्वपक्षमुपसंहरति.

ज्ञानसंतानः- संवित् = विज्ञानम्, संवेद्यः - देहः; शरीरसंतानः ताभ्यां व्यतिरिक्तः, नित्यप्रकाशरूपः इति अर्थः. ताभ्यां भिन्नस्य

"दृश्यस्य" - द्रष्टुं योग्यस्य

तस्यानुपलब्धेः = द्रष्टुं योग्यो हि यदा न उपलभ्यते तदा नास्तीति व्यवस्थाप्यते

एतदुक्तं भवति ..... = I-consciousness itself is not the Self, because it is a determinate cognition & it is transitory in nature. There is nothing diff. from the body which is referred to by this "I-consciousness".

→ अहम् - इति शब्दानुविद्धो .... = but the Self consciousness is a form of determinacy because it is associated with the expression "I"

साभिलापे विकल्पाख्यम् = because it is implied in the statement "that determinate knowledge is associated with expression".

→ Does it determine the chain of physical consciousness or chain of feelings because I consciousness is associated with it. Because the possessive affix refers to the chains only & nothing outside.

पूर्वपक्षी अब कहता कि जो आत्मा को स्मृति के द्वारा अनुमान से सिद्ध करते —

वहां भी ऐसा कोई अनुभाविक: दृष्टी में नहीं आता ॥

अत्र आत्माद्यनुमानमुत्थापयितुमाह :-

आत्मवादी = तार्किकादि: , अनुमानम् = अन्वयव्यतिरेकरूपम्
उत्थापयति = समर्थाचरणेन प्रयोजकव्यापारेण तत्र प्रेरयति

The Shaivatma-vadin Says now:—
(At the time of rememberance) when the direct perception Ceases to exist, how can there arise memory, which closely follows the direct perception, if the perceiving Self were not permanent?

अथानुभवविध्वंसे स्मृतिस्तदनुरोधिनी ।
कथं भवेन्न नित्यः स्यादात्मा यद्यनुभावकः ॥२॥

योजना:-

अथ अनुभवविध्वंसे (सति) तद् (अनुभव) ~~अनुभव~~ अनुरोधिनी स्मृति कथं भवेत, — यदि अनुभावकः आत्मा नित्य: न स्यात ?

The Shaiva means to say that the rememberance arises, because the Self (Atma) persisted from the former direct perception to the later rememberance as witness (साक्षी, द्रष्टु:). The experience of rememberance, in fact, shows that the knowledge of the former direct perception is retained in the permanent perceiving Self, which is revived in the later experience of rememberance.

page 59.

Karika – (8).

It is immaterial whether the object of remembrance persists or does not, at the time of recollection. But there is no difference of opinion on this point that the experience does not persist. And remembrance closely follows the direct perception. It is as follows:—

In remembrance the object does not shine indeterminately; nor is there determinative activity related to it; nor do the object and the experience shine separately like two fingers; nor does the object shine as qualified by the experience, as does the man by the stick; because then the judgement would be "this".

In memory, the direct experience shines predominant. But as (the light of) the object is an essentially constituent of the experience, so that object invariably shines in the experience. If, however, the experience be destroyed in every way, how can remembrance in which the chief element is the former experience, have objective reference through it? All worldly transactions depend on memory. Its being cannot, therefore, be denied. It is, therefore, indicative of the <u>existence of something</u> after the <u>destruction of experience</u>. And that something is the <u>experiencer</u>, the essential nature of which is to experience. This is the <u>permanent experiencing self</u>. (More than this has not been mentioned by the author here in order that the statement of prima facie view

P.T.O

may not end here ;) because subsequently he wants to say something more, that remains. The implication of 'how can there be' (कथं भवेत्) may be stated as follows:-

The object can in no way be responsible for memory. And the experience has been destroyed. The rise of memory, therefore, would be out of the question. In the absence of it there would be no determinate knowledge, which depends upon the memory of conventional expression. In the absence of the determinate knowledge, people would be no better than the blind, the deaf and the dumb and would perish without being able to cry for help (3)

इह = भासमाने जगति, स्मृतिकाले = स्मृति काल में
सुस्मूर्षितः = स्मर्तुमिष्टः - जो अर्थ किसी ने चाहा हो स्मृत्य में लाना
भवतु ध्वंसतां = वह मरा हो या न मरा है - जैसे मेरी माता, मरी हो या जिंदाह हो स्मृति में लानी हो - अब यह स्मृति विषय बने या न बने
किम् अनेन = किम् तेन, इस से किया होता है
स्मृति हो या न हो इस में केवल इतना ही प्रतीत होता है कि पूर्वकालीन अनुभव मिट चुका है॥
(मृतायाममृतायाञ्च मातरि सा मे मातेति स्मृति दर्शनात् न किंचित् स्मृति विषस्य भवनेन ध्वंसनेन वा इति भावः)
अनुभवः = पूर्व कालीन इति शेषः
तमेव = ध्वस्तमनुभवमेव एव अनुसन्धाना = अपेक्षमाणा अस्य पदस्य अनु सैम्मरणी
स्मृतिं जायते = स्मृति उत्पद्यते
एतदेव समर्थयति ——
प्रकाशः = ग्रहणम्, निर्विकल्पज्ञानम् इति यावत्
अध्यवसाया = तत्समनन्तर भावि सविकल्पज्ञानम्

{ स्मृति अर्थ का ग्रहण नही करती है न अर्थ का निश्चय करती है

In remembrance [illegible] not shine [illegible] is there any determination [illegible] related to it; nor [illegible] object and its experience shine separately like two fingers; nor does the object shine [illegible] by the experience [illegible] by the stick; [illegible] judgment [illegible]

नापि अंगुलिद्वयवत् = अंगुलि द्वयन्यायेन, युगपत्प्रकाशोऽध्यवसायश्च इति योज्यम् -
अनुभवविशिष्टस्य = ~~ज्ञातोयमिति~~ ज्ञातोयमित्यनुभव विशेषण युतस्य
दण्डिवत् = दण्ड विशिष्ट पुरुष न्यायेन इति अर्थः
सर्वत्र = प्रकार चतुष्टयेऽपि | अयमिति प्रत्यय प्रसंगात् अनुभवसांनिध्ये 'स' इति ग्रहणायोगात् इति भावः

अनुभव प्रकाश एव = पूर्व अनुभव स्मरणम् ।

प्रधानम् = यस्य यः प्रकाशः स तत्प्रकाशं विना न प्रकाशितुं योग्यः, न हि नीलारव्य गुण प्रकाशं विना नीलोत्पलो दृष्टः - इति अनुभव अनु प्रकाशस्यैव अर्थ प्रकाश-युक्तायां स्मृतौ प्राधान्यम् इति ॥

"तु" शब्दः अनुभवस्य स्मृतेर्व्यतिरेक द्योतकः,

अर्थ प्रकाशात्मकत्वात् = अर्थ प्रकाश रुपत्वेन

अर्थ प्रकाशाख्य: अर्थावभासः अनुभव प्रकाशनान्तरीयकः अनुभव प्रकाश प्राप्तः भवति ॥

सर्वथा = संस्कारभावेण स्वरूपेणापि

तत्प्रकाशरुपा = अनुभव प्रकाश रुपा, तद्द्वारेण = अनुभव द्वारेण

तया च = स्मृत्य एव असौ = स्मृतिः

अनपह्नवनीया = अपह्नोतुमशक्या सति = भवन्ती

किंचित् = किमप्यनिर्वचनीयं वस्तु, आवेदयति = अनुमापयती - Communicate - E.S.

तदेष = आवेदितं वस्तु एव

ननु किं स्मृतिमात्रेणैव आत्मा सिद्धयुत अन्येनापि आह "इयद"

इयदेव = स्मृति मात्रमेव

तत्तु → आत्मसिद्धेजीवित भूतं वस्तु

आचार्येण ...... = न प्रकटीकृतम्, केन कृत्वा

इत्याशयेन = इत्यभिप्रायेण ·

पूर्व पक्ष इहैव मा समापत = मा समाप्तिं गच्छतु

वक्तव्यं शेष = अवशिष्टे किंचित्, तया विवक्षया = वक्तुम इच्छया

अर्थः = पूर्वं गृहीतः अथ स्मर्यमाणः घटादि ; तस्याम् = स्मृतौ
अकिंचित्करः = न कुछ करने वाला
अनुभवः = ग्रहण कालीनः   ननु मास्तु स्मृति इति अपेक्षायाम् आह
"तदभावे" → स्मृतिः अभावे
संकेतः = वाच्य वाचक भाव संबन्धः   शब्दः = वचक शब्दः,
तयोर्या स्मृतिः तस्या
आयात्ताः = अधीनाः, तद्रूपत्वाद् इति भावः -
ननु अस्तं गच्छन्तु सर्वे विकल्पा ततः किम् आह →
"निर्विकल्पम्" इति   तथा च सति समस्तं जगत्
अन्धमूक बधिर = अन्धा, गूंगा और बहरा
हन्त - कष्टे   निराक्रन्दम् = परस्परं प्रत्याख्यानासमर्थं सत् (विना सद्भाव)
अवसीदेत = नष्ट्यते (ended, finished)

The Cause, as distinct from the effect, has to be conceived as to be efficient to bring about the effect. The Self is of such (as can account for remembrance) इदृ = भासमाने जगति कार्यव्यतिरेकेण = कार्यकारणयोः भिन्नत्वात्

The object is surely remembered and तादृक = तादृशं कारणम् पर्याप्नोति = समर्थो भवति

that is through the स्वयम् आत्मा = त्वया साधिता नित्य आत्मा

shining of the direct अर्थो हि तावत् स्मर्यते = अर्थ का ही स्मरण किया जाता है॥

experience. It has been said that स च = अर्थश्च अनुभवप्रकाशमुखेन = न तु साक्षात्स्मर्यत इति पूर्वेण संबन्धः॥

the direct experience is gone. Therefore if there be something besides, एतत् = स्मृतिरूपं कार्यम् उपयोगी = साधक:

what is that? one स एव = संस्कार एव (आकाश)

might as well say that ... also exists. If it be ... memory) is to be accounted for, not by the ... but ... last traces ... exist in it ... but ... be not matched.

What is the use of this (Self)? ... is ... in the following verse.

सत्यप्यात्मनि दृङ्नाशात्तद् द्वारा दृष्टवस्तुषु।
स्मृतिः केनाथ यत्रैवानुभवस्तत् पदैव सा॥४॥

योजना:- (अत्र सिद्धान्तिनं पूर्वपक्षवादी पृच्छति)
आत्मनि सति अपि, दृग् (अनुभवः) नाशाद् तद् (अनुभव) द्वारा दृष्टवस्तुषु केन स्मृतिः भवति? अथ यत्रैव (विषये) अनुभवः तत्पदैव सा (स्मृतिः).

Eng:-

(The Saugata replies the Shiratma-Vadin:-) Even if there exists a permanent Self, the direct perception having ceased to exist, how can there arise memory of things, experienced through that (perception)? (The Saugata himself gives the reason for the rise of memory:). He says, remembrance depends

Karika-4 page 62-63.

In the remembrance of the Seen, ie objects of direct experience, the direct experience is the means of its relation to the object. And that experience is lost, though the Self may persist. For, if that ~~experience~~ ~~is~~ be not lost, ~~though~~ the ~~Self may pers~~ object would continuously shine as "this": Therefore, there would be no remembrance. How

what ~~...~~ remembrance will then mean.

when ~~Com~~, there~~fore~~ would be no remembrance. How Can, therefore, the (admission of) Experiencer explain it?

~~...~~ The experience itself becomes memory at the memory stage.

"Tatpadā" is an attributive Compound. It means: the object of remembrance, the remembered, is the Same as that of direct experience. "Sa" Stands for remembrance. (4).

upon (refers to) the same thing (as its object) that was the object of the former direct perception. (For this reason, the Saugata thinks that, although the direct perception of the former time does not exist at the time of the later remembrance, it can still be the object of the remembrance (asato'pi anubhavasya viṣayena sā viṣaya-vati) as such there is no need of assuming the existence of Ātma.

सत्यप्य = हो भी अगर आत्मनि = बोधात्मनि एकेनाप्यः =

तत् द्वारा = पूर्व अनुभव ही उपाय जिसका है अनुभव के भिन्न और एक

दृष्टु वस्तुषु = नीलादिषु जो पहिले देखे होते हैं (पूर्व अनुभूतेषु)

केन स्मृतिः भवेत् = किस तरह उन देखे हुए वस्तुओं की स्मृति आयेगी

अथ = इस तरह भ से भी हम कह सकते है

यत्रैवानुभवः =
तत् पदेव सा = } यह अनुभव ही स्मर्यमान वस्तु के पद पर स्मृति कहलाती है

दृष्टेषु अनुभूतेषु वस्तुषु = पूर्वं अनुभूतेषु ~~नीलादि~~नीलादि वस्तु

यास्मृतिः = या स्मृति भवति, तस्याम् = स्मृतौ

दृगात्मा = दृग्रूपा :, अनुभवः = पूर्वं अनुभवः ; द्वारम् = उपायः भवति.

अन्यथा स इति तस्या उत्थाने न स्यात् इति भावः ॥

अर्थो स्पर्शी = अर्थ के ग्रहण करने पर

ननु ततः किम् इति आह, "स च" स च अनुभवः = द्वारभूतो-अनुभवश्च →

आत्मनि सत्यपि नष्टः = ~~नष्टस्य~~

न ह्यन्यस्यावस्थानमात्रेणान्यस्य नष्टस्य नाशाभवो वक्तुं शक्य इति भावः

ननु ततोऽपि किम् इति आह – "तस्य" इति

अत्रुटितः = अविच्छिन्नः

का स्मृतिः = एतत् च व्यर्थत्वम् स्मृतेः स्यात्

तदनुभाविता = अर्थानुभाविता

किं कुर्यात् = अनुभवेनैव अर्थप्रकाशनात् न अस्य स्मृति उपयोगिनी इति भावः

योजना :- आत्मनि सत्यपि, तद्द्वारा – अनुभवद्वारेण,
दृष्टवस्तुषु = पूर्वानुभूतेषु नीलादिषु, भवन्ती स्मृतिः
दृङ्नाशात – अनुभवाख्य कारणनाशात् हेतु,
केन स्यात्, न हि कारणाभावे कार्यस्य युक्तत् इति भावः ॥

यत्रैव .. वृत्तः = पूर्वं संपन्नः

पदम् = विषयः

~~स~~ स्मर्यमाणम् = स्मृति विषयी क्रियमाणम्, न तु अनुभूयमानम् इति ~~अर्थः~~ ॥

page 64 - karika (5).

The direct experience produces a befitting residual trace ~~and the residual trace~~ and this residual trace (Samskara) is responsible for the restoration of the former condition (of the Subject) as in the case of the branch of a tree forced down, or the birch-bark, kept rolled up for long & then spread out. Therefore, in the present case also, the residual trace, will make the memory conform to the former experience. Thus the object of the direct experience becomes the object of memory.

If so, what is the use of the Self? For, just as carrying of a useless thing means unnecessary & troublesome speculation. All worldly transactions can be accounted for in terms of residual traces (5).

"सा" →

Even if there exists self, the essential nature of which is knowledge, but the former perception together with its object is absent in Smṛti. Hence, in the absence of the object, Smṛti also cannot arise. The Saugata replies here, Smṛti can have as its object that which was the object of the former direct perception though it is not existing then; ("असतो ऽप्यसतोऽर्थानुभवस्य विषयेण सा विषयवती").

ज्ञानान्तरस्य = अनुभवरूपस्य, तस्याः - स्मृतेः
∴ कथं सा नष्टस्य अनुभवस्य विषयेण विषयवती इत्यत्र हेतुमाह, — "यतो हि इति", ~~मत~~ -

यतो हि पूर्वानुभवसंस्कारात्स्मृतिसंभवः।
यद्येवमन्तर्गडुना कोऽर्थः स्यात्स्थायिनात्मना॥५॥

योजना :- यतः (यस्मात्कारणात्) पूर्वानुभव - संस्कारात् स्मृति-~~संभ~~ संभवः (तस्मात् तद्विषय एव स्मृतेर्विषयः)[2] यदि एवं, स्थायिनात्मना अन्तर्गडुना को अर्थः स्यात्? 3-4.

Notes 2 - ...

*2 अनुभवात्संस्कारः संस्काराच्च स्मृतिर्जायमाना तं पूर्वानुभवम् अनुकुर्वत्यवगाहितविषयं तमनुभवम् अवभासयति।.

*3 अनुपयोगिना आत्मस्थैर्येण किम्॥

*4 संस्कारस्यात्मवादे ऽप्यङ्गीकरणात् तेनैव स्मृतेः सिद्धेः.

Refer Eng: The Atma is supposed by the Atma-Vādin [Karika 6)

to be the Substratum of attributes or qualities (dharmas) like pleasure, pain, Cognition etc, including residual traces, yet it is unaffected by them. It can be Concluded from this that a permanent Self has nothing to do with remembrance which functions by residual traces only. So it is useless to suppose the existence of a permanent Self.

for 6th Shaloka / Introduction

Shaloka No 5 Teeka

अनुभवेन हि .... = अनुभव से संस्कार पैदा होता है -

यह बात तो — स्वउचितः — ~~स्व~~ न तु स्वविलक्षणः आपने ही कही है ॥ स्वस्मिनुचितः

'स्थितिम् = अवस्थानम् स्थापयति = स्वयं तिष्ठन्तीं प्रयोजक व्यापारेण तत्र प्रेरयति॥

संस्कारश्च .... = संस्कार पूर्व अनुभव को अनुभूत विषय की (पहिली जैसी) स्थिति ठहराता है

जैसे — *आकृष्ट प्रारवादे = समेटे हुई प्रारवें जैसे

संवर्तितस्य = जब उन को अच्छी तरह ~~फैलाया~~ समेटा जाये

भूर्जादिः विवर्त्यमानस्य = या जैसे भर्जादि पत्र फैला हो

तेन = उसी तरह

* आकृष्टश्च असौ प्रारवादिः तस्य, आकृष्टा हि वक्रा प्रारवा मोचिता सती पुनरेव ऋजुतारूपेण स्वस्थाने तिष्ठति॥

चिरम् ~~सर्व~~ संवर्तितस्य = बहुकालात् आरभ्य वेष्टितस्य

विवर्त्यमानस्य = विकासितस्य

चिरं वेष्टितं हि भूर्जपत्रादिके प्रसार्य मुक्तं सत् संस्कारवशेन पुनस्तथैव तिष्ठति

तेन = प्रोक्त संस्कार लक्षणं प्रकृतेऽपि योजयति,

पूर्वानुभवानुकारिणीम् = पूर्वानुभव सदृशीम्, प्राक्तन रूपां स्थितिं स्थापयेत

इति = अतः कारणात्

तत् एतद्विषय एव = अनुभव विषय एव

स्मृतिः स्मृते विषयो भवति, पूर्वानुभूतमात्र विषय-त्वात् इति भावः

एतेन स्मृतिहेतोः संस्कारस्यापि स्थितिस्थापकत्वम् उक्तम् ॥

यद् एवं तर्हि = एतेन पूर्वार्धस्य सिद्धान्तिपक्षत्वं सूचितम् -

गुडः = कुब्जपृष्ठस्थो मांसपिण्डः, स हि आयासकारी -

किं तेन = न किंचिदप्य आत्मने इति अर्थः ॥5॥ end

Kārikā (6) – page 64

पूर्वपक्ष?

Objection :- But the substratum of the Saṃskāra has to be stated for the Saṃskāra is a quality and therefore needs a substratum. That substratum itself is the Self (Ātmā). To this the author replies as follows:-

If in consequence of the rise of Saṃskāra some change takes place in the Self, that change being in the Self itself, it cannot be maintained to be eternal. But if it be asserted that the Self remains unaffected (by Saṃskāra) ~~the Saṃskāra be admitted~~ then it is useless for the Self. If (follow Vaishiṣika) the Saṃskāra be admitted to be a particularity of Self, then it means that Self is not different from other changing things; that Saṃskāras arise in sentient Self and that it is transient. For, the (admission of) Saṃskāra implies that it is different from direct experience & that it indirectly produces a peculiar effect, called remembrance. But if it be asserted that the विशेषण (creating विशेषण = adjective quality) (as admitted by Visheshika) is distinct from Self then what ~~should be then~~ is it to Self? And we shall combat the view of independent being of relations. The same may be asserted about cognition, pleasure, desire, aversion, effort, merit and demerit.

Therefore, even if we admit the attributes to be distinct from Self, there being no change in

P.T.O.

essential nature of Self inspite of their presence, Self cannot be said to remember, because its original unremembering and unaffected nature is in tact. Therefore, memory can be established on the basis of Sanskāra only. And the rememberer who figures in judgement "I remember" is identical with either the physical or the cognitional chain. Hence it is like perceiver. For, it has been stated in an earlier verse that the "I-consciousness" refers to body etc. Thus all arguments based on perception & inference, in support of the existence of Self have been refuted. And some arguments against it have been hinted at (1) otherwise (if it retains its original nature in spite of affection by qualities) the admission of affection is meaningless. This asserted in the following:-

"If it (Self) be like skin it is transcient. If it be like ether it is as good as nought. For, ether is unaffected by heat & shower. Their effect is on skin only." (6).

(विषयाश्रयः = the base of विषयाश्रयाः = affections qualifications. Atma is self pure and unchanging. If is qualified it is not atma if not qualified it is useless. This is the Buddhist argument. Only

Atma is supposed by the Atma-vadin to be the Substratum of attributes or qualities (Dharmas) like pleasure, pain, cognition etc including the residual traces, yet it is unaffected by them. It can be concluded from this that a permanent Self has nothing to do with remembrance which functions by residual trace only so it is useless to suppose existence of a permanent Self.

ततो भिन्नेषु धर्मेषु तत्स्वरूपाविशेषतः ।
संस्कारात्स्मृतिसिद्धौ स्यात्स्मर्ता द्रष्टेव कल्पितः ॥६॥

योजना :- (संस्कारः गुणत्वात् आश्रयम् अपेक्षते, य आश्रयः स आत्मा)
(सुखदुःख ज्ञान संस्कारादि) धर्मेषु ततः (आत्मनः) भिन्नेषु, तत (आत्मा) - स्वरूप - अविशेषतः संस्कारात् स्मृति सिद्धौ, स्मर्ता इव कल्पितः स्यात् ।

(The Shaivatma-vadin objects to this point. He thinks that residual trace is a quality and therefore, needs a Substratum. That Substratum is the Self. The Saugata replies to this objection.)

"ननु" इति — एतेन परिशेषानुमानाश्रित्य स्थिर आत्मा शंकितः
तस्यैव संस्कारस्य = उसी संस्कार का जो गुण रूप है
आश्रयो = उस ~~गुण रूप~~ संस्कार का जो आश्रय है
वक्तव्यः To be described. स हि = वह संस्कार तो
गुणत्वात् = गुण रूप होने से
आश्रयमपेक्षते = आश्रय (गुणी की अपेक्षा रखता है ॥
य आश्रयः स आत्मा स्यात् - जो भी यह आश्रय है वही आत्मा है - इस शङ्का पर कहता है ॥

ततः = इस कारण भिन्नेषु धर्मेषु = भिन्न भिन्न जो गुण हैं
तत् स्वरूप अविशेषतः उस स्वरूप में कोई भेदरूप, गुण रूप, कणी व्याप्ती नहीं हो सकती
इस लिए. संस्कारात्स्मृतिसिद्धौ = इस कारण स्मृति की सिद्धि संस्कार से ही है
स्यात्स्मर्ता द्रष्टेव कल्पिता = इस लिए यह स्मर्ता या द्रष्टा जो तुम कहते हो ~~आदि~~ सब कल्पना मात्र है ॥

इह = अत्र लोके , संस्कार जायमाने = संस्कार के उपजने से

यदि आत्मनो = अगर आत्मा को विशेषः = भेद आया ∴

∴ पूर्वावस्थाया भेदः स = विशेषः

अव्यतिरिक्तः = आत्माभिन्नः (not special)

इति न नित्य आत्मा स्यात् = न हि पूर्वरूपादिविशिष्टस्यात एव स्वरूपात्प्रच्युतस्य नित्यत्वं युक्तं

तो भेद सहन करने से वह नित्य नहीं

अथ = या कहे अस्य = आत्मनः न विशेषः = कोई भेद नहीं आया

तेन = संस्कारेण , तर्हि = अस्य आत्मनः

किम् = व्यर्थत्वात् न किंचित् पुनरपि = पूर्ववदेव

अथ संस्कार एव ---- विशेषः = अगर संस्कार से भेद आया क्योंकि उस से संस्कार अभिन्न मान कर -

पुनरपि = पूर्ववदेव

ज्ञाने = ज्ञानरूपे – संस्काररूपे आत्मनि अनित्ये = ज्ञान क्षणिक होने के कारण

विशिष्टं = तत् इति स्थितात्वाद् इदम् इति स्थिताद् अनुभवाद् भिन्न यत् स्मृत्याख्यकार्यं तत्करोतीति तादृशम्

स्मृ कार्य ~~(स~~ कारि = स्मृतिकार्य का हेतु यानी संस्कार

(इसी ही ज्ञान माना जायेत -)

परम्परया = न तु साक्षात्

(अनुभवो हि साक्षात् स्मृतिमेव जनयति संस्कार तु तदद्वारेण)

अथः = सिद्धान्ति प्रश्ने प्रोकते, संस्कारात्मा = संस्काररूपः

उत्तरमाह — तस्य = आत्मनः असौ = संस्कारः

किम् — न हि व्यतिरिक्तस्य ~~संबन्धत्वं~~ संबद्धत्वं युक्तम् भावः

न कोऽपि अर्थः no use

संबन्धव्यतिरिक्तो = नहि-व्य जब संबन्ध ही भिन्न रहे

निराकरिष्यते = तो वह है ही नही - नहि व्यतिरिक्तस्य
संबन्धत्वं युक्तं ✓

एवं = संस्कारवद् .... = यह सभी इसी
तरह समझने चहियें॥

भिन्नेषु = भेदयुक्तेषु   धर्मेषु = ज्ञानादिक धर्म

"विशेषणाभावात" = नहि भिन्नं विशेषणं युक्तं॥
सामानाधिकरण्येन स्थितस्य नीलारव्यस्य गुणस्यै-
वोत्पलविशेषणत्वादिति भाव:
अनुदित संस्कारादि धर्मात् पूर्वरूपात् न विशेष:,
विशेषे हि अनित्यत्वं तस्मात् संस्कारादेव पूर्वोक्त
न्यायेन स्मृति सिद्धा, य यत्तु अहं स्मतिा भासते,
तत्र तावत् असौ न आत्मा क्षनिकत्वात् अस्थिरत्वात्
॥

No qualification (adjective) attribute is possible. (This is what is called dry argumentation of dry(hypo)plus) but they limit the universal unlimited free Self in limitations. This will be explained further on.

न व्याप्रियेत = व्यापारं कर्तुं न शक्नोति॥

असंस्कृतरूपम् = अनुत्पन्नसंस्काररूपम्

आदौ स्थितं प्राच्यरूप आदि प्राच्यरूपम्,
संस्कारात्पूर्वं स्थितं रूपमिति यावत्॥

इति = फलितमाह — अत: कारणात्

ननु यद्येवं तर्हि "अहं स्मरामि" - इह जो "अहं" शब्द
है इस ने किया किया।

सोपि....... यथा द्रष्टा = यथा द्रष्टा शरीरसन्तानो
ज्ञानसंतानश्च अध्यवसीयते तथा स्मर्ता अपि
इति शब्द अर्थ:॥

पूर्वं इति = ननु स्वलक्षणेत्यादिना शरीरादिवसायिनी - इत्यन्तेन →

एवम् = उपसंहारं करोति आत्मनि = आत्मा के संभव होने पर

साधके प्रमाणे — वह था कि स्मृति है तो स्मर्ता (आत्मा) भी है

यह प्रत्यक्ष अनुमान है

बाधकम् = बाधक प्रमाण → धर्मयोग = अगर गुणों के साथ आत्मा का संबन्ध हो -

नित्यताहानि = तो नित्यता आत्मा की नहीं रहती.

अन्यथा किं तेन —— अन्यथा = धर्मयोगस्य नित्यताहानि हेतुत्वाभावे, तेन = धर्मयोगेन

वर्षातपाभ्यां किं व्योम्नश्चर्मण्यस्ति तयोः फलम् ।
चर्मोपमश्चेत्सोऽनित्यः खतुल्यश्चेदसत्समः ॥

सः = आत्मा, चर्मोपमः = वर्षातपरूपधर्म प्राप्त कोमलत्व काठिन्य विशेष चर्म सदृशः

चेद् = भवेत तदा ← अनित्यः स्यात, चर्मवदेवेति शेष

पुनः स आत्मा खतुल्यः — वर्षातपविशेषरहित-आकाशसदृश्चेत् स्यात् तदा

असत्समः = आशवत् न किंचिद्रूप इव भवेत् ।

* श्लोकद्वयेन मानसप्रत्यक्षात्मवादिनामतं दूषितम् । ततः अथानुभवेत्यादिना कोऽर्थः स्यात् स्थायिनात्मना - इत्यन्तेन अनुमेयात्मवादिमतं दूषितम् । तदनु, ततो भिन्नेषु — इत्यनेन इच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्न सुखदुख ज्ञानानि आत्मनि इति सूत्रकारवचनात् पुनरपि यत् इच्छादिभिर्गुणैः गुणिन आत्मनो अनुमेयत्वे प्रत्यपादि तद्दूष्यत - इति

* इत्थम् = प्रत्यक्षानुमानरूप साधक प्रमाण पराकरणेन बाधक सूचनेन च इति अर्थः ।
ऐश्वर्यम् = ज्ञान क्रिया कर्तृत्वरूपम् , परीक्षितुम् = परीक्षाविषयी कर्तुम् ॥

Now the oponant starts negating the qualification of Atma as Knower & Doer. ज्ञातृ कर्तृ खण्डनम्

ज्ञानं च चित्स्वरूपं चेत्तदनित्यं किमात्मवत् ।
अथापि जडमेतस्य कथमर्थप्रकाशता ॥७॥

योजना:- ज्ञानं च चित्स्वरूपं चेत् , किं तद् आत्मवत् अनित्यम् ? अथापि एतत् (ज्ञानं) जडम् (ततः) एतस्य अर्थ प्रकाशता कथं स्यात् ?

* (After refuting the existence of a permanent Self, the Sangata now refutes its possession of powers of Knowledge & Action. He first examines the power of Knowledge).

Eng: The Sangatā says, if the power of knowledge be admitted to be of the nature of Sentiency, then is transient like Self? But, if it is admitted to be insentient, how can it make the objects manifest!

सिद्धान्तिमताश्रयणेन ← पराभ्युपगमेन = जो आत्मवादी ने अङ्गीकार किया है
एतत् = एतस्य श्लोकस्य वाच्यतया स्थितम् ॥
प्रसङ्गापादनम् = जो उस ने अनिष्ठ सिद्ध किया है
(आत्मा अनिष्ठा पैदा करना)
प्रसङ्गविपर्ययलाभो मे भविष्यति = यह तुम्हारा अनिष्ठ भाव ही मेरे लिए लाभदायक है
इष्टलाभः
अनिष्ठापादनम्

~~Karika (8) Page 70.~~

Karika-8.

Now the author puts forth, as prima facie view, the theory of the Sankhya, that cognition though insentient in itself, illumines the external object as follows:-

In our practical life we say "I know the object". Such a statement really means "the object is manifest to me". But manifestness or luminosity cannot be asserted to be the real essential nature of the object. For, then it would be manifest either to all or to none and all would be either all-knowing or perfectly ignorant. Nor, can the luminosity be supposed to have come to the object from else-where. For, in that case also there will be the same flaw. Therefore, it has to be admitted that this luminosity belongs to some other Tattva (which is Budhi).

To the question: How even on that supposition does the object become luminous"? the reply is that the object is reflected in that Tattva. That Tattva is capable of receiving reflection, because the quality of Sattva predominates in it. However, it cannot receive reflections of all simultaneously, because it is enveloped by the quality of Tamas. But this Tamas is partly removed by Rajas. Hence it receives the reflection of some (with [illegible] quality of) object only. That Tattva is technically called "Budhi" and Cognition (ज्ञानं:) is nothing but the reflection of external object (on Budhi). It is a form of Bhudhi. It is a peculiar modification of Bhudhi, different from that of milk into curd, which is responsible

P.T.O

for substitution of the former name (Budhi) by another (Jñāna-ज्ञान:). Thus, Budhi assumes the ~~external~~ ~~form~~ form of external object.

But both 'prakrati' and 'Budhi' are insentient because Sattva etc (which constitute) them being essentially of the nature of pleasure, pain and ignorance, are objects of experience. Hence Budhi lacks self-luminosity, like a mirror. An experiencer, therefore, which is different from Budhi, ~~had~~ has to be admitted, because it does not stand to reason to admit Budhi which is an object of experience and, therefore, without luminosity, to be an experiencer, which is its opposite and is characterised by Self-luminosity. The experiencer, therefore, has to be essentially different from it. The essential nature of the experiencer is Self-luminosity. For, how can the objectivity, which is of an opposite nature and lacks self luminosity, be possibly supposed to be the essential nature of the experiencer. And if he were the illuminator of the entire objective world simply because of his self-luminosity then the entire objective world should shine simultaneously & there should be no distinction between the cognition of Jar and that of cloth and there confusion should reign supreme in the world. The experiencer however is different from the reflection, the thing that casts it and the Budhi Tattva, on which it is cast and is unrelated to them. How can he then illumine the object? There, (it has to be admitted that) Budhi itself, because of its crystalline purity

contd on page 3.

Page 3 . . .

receives the reflection of Self-luminous Self also. Thus, the objects became manifest to Self-luminous Subject (reflected in Budhi) when he comes in touch with external object, which also is reflected on the Budhi Tattva, on which his own luminosity is reflected because it (Budhi) is capable of receiving the reflection of Subjective luminosity. This is the explanation of the practical life. Thus cognition though insentient in itself, because it is non-different from the insentient Budhi, illumines the object, because it is in contact with the reflection of Self luminous Subject. This is an unreasonable supposition that Self-luminous Subject casts its reflection on another Budhi.

P.T.O.

2nd part:—

Here if Budhi itself be admitted to be Sentient, its eternality will naturally follow. But if even the Sentient is not eternal, then there is no eternal Self, which may be represented to possess the cognitive power. Therefore, Jnana (ज्ञानः) alone is. Its essential nature is to make the objects manifest. It is of different type such as determinate knowledge, and the remembrance. This explains all worldly transactions. This is again, accruing from the refutation of an unwelcome conclusion (that follows from the assumption of the Sankhya theory as correct). This is the substance of the preceding two verses: And if Cognition (ज्ञानः) be admitted to be Sentient".

For, we see that one thing casts its reflection on another, which is similar in quality and is more crystaline that than that which is reflected, for instance form of a jar is reflected in a perceptible mirror. But the difference between the Subject and the Budhi is very great and Budhi is not more crystaline than the Subject. The word "इयता" implies that this much will do.

But even the theory of reflection does not answer the objective (against permanent Subject). The author demonstrates this far as follows:—.

Next part :— <u>Budhi is alive the dead cannot</u> [illegible] <u>assume the object</u>

Teeka.

If, in consequence of the contact with the reflection of the Sentient, that on which the Self-luminous Subject is reflected, does not itself become Sentient, the reflection will serve no purpose. For, the mirror <u>on which the heap of fire is reflected</u>, cannot burn any thing. But if you say that, on which reflection falls, becomes essentially the same as the original luminosity, then the <u>latter is non-different from Budhi</u>. Thus, Budhi becomes identical with the <u>original luminosity</u>. The opponent, however, had propounded the theory of reflection for fear of error of attributing an opposite quality (sentiency) to Budhi. It is therefore, that (attributed opposite quality) which manifests its power of effulgent light. Why then not assume the Budhi to be <u>Sentient ([illegible])</u>; what is the use of assuming separate existence of purusha? Thus, if Budhi assumes the form of the object, reflection of which falls on it: this view is then exactly what the <u>Vigjanavadins holds</u>. But if anybody were to question why does it assume the form of the object? the reply is "because of the already existing chain of Causation (i.e the revival of the previous beginingless <u>Vasna</u>)".

P.T.O

Karika (7)
page 68.

Here the objector admits the view of the exponent, thinking that thus he will be able to strengthen his own position by pointing out the logical defects in it. Those who admit the Self prove its eternity as follows:-

The so called time, becoming an attribute of what is characterised by "thisness", delimits it and makes it transient through this delimitation. But the Self is sentient and therefore is not experienced as "this". Hence it is not delimited by the attribute (of time). For, the substance-attribute-relation depends upon a unifier and there is no unifier in the case of the Self shining Self.

He who maintains the position just stated, may be asked the following questions:-

The (power of) cognition also is admitted to be self-shining. The same logic, therefore, applies to it also. Why is then (the power of) cognition eternal? Further there is no relation between two eternals. For there, the position that the Self possesses the power of knowledge falls to the ground. But if cognition be not admitted to be Self-shining, it will not be able to illuminate the objects. For, cognition illumines the objects by taking them into its own self-luminosity. Therefore, if it be devoid of self-luminosity in itself, just like any object, it will not be able to illumine any object (7).

This is a far - The qualification of this implies "at this time" showing that the jar exists now: may not exist tomorrow or was not existing yesterday. So it is existing at present only and thus is not a permanent being reducing this ness by the qualification of time. But the greatness of the time with it. So our cognitions are not permanent - We have said in the preceding proved that Atma is not a relation at all. See same relative to cognitive that is applied to the soul also. Thus logic is transient and thus proves not illumined so that it cannot light up other objects at all. 7.

तत्र = "नित्य और अनित्य" पर

कालो नाम् = कालाख्यं वस्तु

इदं भावविशिष्टस्य = इदंभावावच्छिन्नस्य घटादे :

विशेषणताम् = विशेषणभावम् adjectiveness

इदंभाव विशिष्टं पदार्थं अविशिष्टं विशिष्टो कुर्वंस्तस्मिन स्वरूप भूतो यः कालः संकोचस्तस्मात् ॥

तम् = इदंभावावच्छिन्नं घटादिकम् ,

विशिष्टीकुर्वन = अविशिष्टं विशिष्टं संपादयन् तस्मिन स्वरूपभूते काले

यः संकोचः = अवच्छेदः तस्मात् -

अनित्यं संपादयति = एतेन अनित्यपदार्थस्य भेदत्वे जाते

"अयं घटो भवति" इति हि प्रयोगे इदंभावविशिष्टस्य घटस्य स्फुटं वर्तमान कालेन संकोचः, तदेवानित्यत्वे कालकृतसंकोचस्यैवानित्यत्वात् ॥

ननु भवत्वेवं ततः किम् - आह - आत्मन एव - नित्य आत्मको

इदम इति प्रथनाभावेन = अहमिति स्फुरति विषयत्वमात्रात् सिद्धेव इदमिति ज्ञान विषयत्वाभावेन

विशेष्यत्वम् - कालाख्यविशेषणविशिष्टत्वम। कथं नास्तीत्यत आह - (प्रमेयत्वम)

विशेषण = प्रमाण प्रमेय भावो 'विशेषण'

योजकायत्तः = संबन्धकर्तुरायत्तः न तु स्वभाविकः, अन्यथा एक एकं प्रति विशेषणमपरं प्रति विशेष्य इति न स्याद् इति भावः, अत एव च अस्य संबन्धभासनं कथयति ॥

(• depends upon a unifier.)

ननु ततोऽपि किम् इति आह - "न च"

योजकान्तरम् = स्वप्रकाशादात्मनोऽन्यो योजकः

सः = उत्तर पक्षवादिरूपो नित्यात्मवादी

पर्यनुयुज्यते = पर्यनुयोगविषयतां नीयते -

पर्यनुयोगमेव स्फुटीकरोति

ज्ञानम् = ऐश्वर्यभूता ज्ञान प्राप्तिः   इति = ~~तस्मात~~ अतः कारणात्

तत्रापि = ज्ञानेऽपि   ननु भवतु तदपि ~~नित्यमेव~~ नित्यमेवेत्य आह

ननु कथं न नित्ययोर्द्वयोः संबन्धः स्यात् – "न च" इति अपेक्षायाम आह – "कार्यं"

अवसन्नम् = नष्टम्

परस्यापि = ~~स्व~~ स्वव्यतिरिक्त घटादेरपि   अदः = इदम् ज्ञानम्

न प्रकाशः = प्रकाशरूपो न भवेत, प्रमातारमनपेक्ष्य स्वप्रकाशस्य दीपस्येव घट प्रकाशत्वादर्शनादिति भावः

कुतो न प्रकाश इति आह –

"स्वप्रकाश" इति   हि = यस्मात्

बोधः = ज्ञानम्   परस्य = घटादेः, स्वप्रकाश यद्रूपम = निजस्वरूपम्

तत्र आवेशनम – प्रवेशनम्

विदधत् = कुर्वन्

परस्यापि = घटादेरपि

प्रकाशो भवति = प्रकाशाविष्टस्य घटस्य प्रकाशेन दीपस्यापि तत् प्रकाशत्मेव .

~~तत्र~~ उपसंहारं करोति "ततः" इति । असौ – बोधः

भावान्तरवत् = बोधव्यतिरिक्त घटादिपदार्थवत् ॥

یہاں ہے کہ آئینہ آتا عکس پڑتا ہے اور پھر بابا کی
جیسے کا عکس دو عکس آئینے کی طرح پڑتے ہیں
تو یہ یا میری جیسے کو خدا پر ... مگر خود ...
کیسا ہے کہ کیا آئینے میں آگے کا عکس پڑتا ہے
اس عکس میں جلانے کی طاقت ...

∴ अजडा सैवं → Another idea which seems to be in the mind of the author, that insentient buddhi can have no capacity to manifest objects, even if it receives the reflection of चैतन्य from Atma, just as a mirror receiving reflection of the flames of burning fire, cannot have the capacity to burn, so in that case also we shall have to admit that Bhudi in itself is sentient by nature. This

जडोऽपि = अनित्यतादोषापातात् जडभावेनाङ्गीक्रियमाणोऽपि

असौ = बोधः   सांख्यमतमिदम्, तार्किकमतस्य निराकृतत्वात् इति भावः

अथार्थस्य यथा रूपं धत्ते बुद्धिस्तथात्मनः।
चैतन्यमजडा सैवं जाड्ये नार्थप्रकाशता ॥८॥

योजना :- जडोऽपि एतत् (ज्ञानम्) इत्थं (सांख्यमत अनुसारेण) अर्थस्य प्रकाशो भविष्यति — इति।

अथ बुद्धि यथा अर्थस्य रूपं (प्रतिबिम्बत्वेन) धत्ते, तथा आत्मनः चैतन्यम् (अपि धत्ते) (तस्मात् बुद्धिरिव स्वच्छत्वात् च प्रकाश प्रतिबिम्बमपि परिगृह्णाति), एवं सा अजडा, सा (बुद्धिः) (अर्थचित्प्रतिबिम्बद्वय ग्रहणेऽपि) जडेव, (बुद्धिः) जाड्ये न अर्थ-प्रकाशता (भवितुम् अर्हति)[2] ∴

अथ' प्रश्ने, बुदिर्यथा बाहिरर्थस्य रूपं धत्ते- प्रतिबिम्बत्वेन गृह्णाति, तथा अन्तः आत्मनः — भोक्तुः, चैतन्य-स्वरूप-भूतां चेतनताम्, धत्ते, तथा जडत्वेऽपि तस्या अर्थप्रकाशनं युक्तमेवेति भावः।

(In the first case, the view point of Baudha is established; viz that both Atma and the power of knowledge are transient. The second case can be considered to according to the view of the Sānkhya theory, that is to say that knowledge, though intransient in itself, yet illuminates the external objects as follows :—).

—

If it be said that Budhi assumes the sentiency of the Self exactly as it does the form of external object (as a reflection). (Because of its crystalline purity, it can receive the reflection of the Self luminous Self also.).

तत्र = तस्मिन् व्यवहारे, इत्येतावानेव परमार्थं अस्ति।
इत्येतावान कः? "अर्थस्य प्रकाशः" इति — ज्ञानस्य प्रकाशमात्रसारत्वादिति भाव:

तत् = प्रोक्त परमार्थे तस्मिन् व्यवहारे "एतत् जानामि" इति शब्द वाच्य ज्ञानम् —

अत्र हेतुमाह — "सर्वम्" इति

तथात्व प्रसंगात् = ज्ञातत्व प्रसंगात्, नहि नीलमेकमेव प्रति नीलमिति भाव:

इति = अतः कारणात्, ननु एतदर्थस्य सहजं रूपं मा भवतु आगन्तुकं तु स्याद् इतिआह —

एतत् = ज्ञानाख्यम्। रूपम् = स्वरूपम् "नास्ति"

आगन्तुकं = अपनी इच्छा से आने वाला, बिन बुलाये आने वाला

तत्त्वान्तरे = प्रतिबिंब ग्रहण उचितम्

अयं धर्मः = ज्ञानाख्यो धर्मः उपसंक्रामति = लगति

ग्राहे = ग्रहणे योग्यम् = उचितम्

सत्त्व प्राधान्यात् = सत्त्वगुण प्रधानत्वेन, निर्मलत्वात्

तमसा = तमो गुणेन आच्छादितत्वात् = आवृत- सकलस्य — देशकालादि विप्रकृत्वात्, प्राविप्रकृष्टस्य समस्त वस्तुनः,

प्रतिबिंबनतः = प्रतिबिम्ब ग्रहणात्,

ननु तर्हि कथं देशकालार्थविप्रकृष्टं गृह्णाति इति आह "रजसा"

विप्रकृष्टं = खींचना, alienated, संबन्ध से दूर ना

लपटना ← व्यावर्तितम् : व्यावृत्तम् , ननु तर्हि कथं देशकालाद्यप्रकृष्टं गृह्णाति, इति आह —

'रजसा' — रजोगुणेन अपसारणात् = निवारणात् , रजोगुणस्यैव प्रवृत्तिरूपत्वात्

"ज्ञाने" → अहं घटः जानामि

किंचिदेव - अविप्रकृष्टमेव , यथा निःश्वासान्धो भागे तद्वद्धि दर्पणः किंचिदेव प्रतिबिंबं गृह्णाति तो तथा —

"तदेव" — सांख्यमते हि बुद्धेरेव ज्ञानकर्तृत्वम् .

ननु तर्हि ज्ञाने किमस्ति — आह — 'अर्थ' इति

अर्थस्य प्रतिबिंबग्रहः - प्रतिबिंबग्रहणात् , तद्रूपमिति यावत् ज्ञानम् ।

अस्य — बुद्धितत्त्वस्य

वृत्तिरूपम् = वर्तनरूपम् , परिणामरूपमिति भवति,

ज्ञाने कीदृशम्? पूर्वः = पूर्वकालीनः

योऽयपदेशः — क्षीरेत्यादि नाम , तस्य तिरोधायको यो दध्यादि परिणामः , दध्यवस्थायां क्षीरेति नाम न तिष्ठत्येव, ततो विलक्षणो यः परिणतिविशेषः ,

~~स आत्मा यस्य तादृशम्~~

उपसंहारं करोति 'एवम्" धारयति = प्रतिबिंबत्वेन इति शेषः

सत्त्वादीनाम् = प्रकृत्यादिमध्ये इत्यर्थः

इयत् = बुद्धिपर्यन्तं तत्त्वद्वयमपि .

भोग्यत्वात् जडं भवति , अन्येषु ग्राहकत्वेऽपि स्वग्रहणे परापेक्षत्वात् -

इति = अतः कारणात् -

दर्पणवत् अप्रकाशम् = प्रकाशव्यतिरिक्तस्वभावम् भवति ।

सहि सत्त्वप्रकाशो आलोककल्पो इति अर्थः॥

युक्त्यनुपाती = युक्त्य अनुसारीति यावत्

स च = भोक्ता च

स्वभावान्तर - जडाऽप्रकाश-रूपोऽन्यः स्वभावः

संभाव्येते = संभावयितुं शक्येत -

स च = प्रकाश स्वभावो भोक्ता च -

प्रकाशमात्रस्वभावत्वेनैव = वाह्यसाधनं विनैव

ननु प्रकाशतां ततः किमित्येत् आह "घट" इति, अन्यथा युगपत्त्वायोगाद् इति भावः,

संकीर्येत = संकर विषयतां गच्छेत, तत इव घटेऽपि पटव्यवहारः स्याद्

स च = भोक्ता च

तदाधारात् = अर्थ प्रतिबिंब-आधारात

प्रकाश प्रतिबिंबम् = प्रकाश स्वभाव भोक्तृ प्रतिबिंबम्

ततः = यतः प्रकाश प्रतिबिंबमपि गृह्णाति अतः कारणात् -

प्रकाशस्य = पुरुषस्य यः प्रतिबिंबतो भवति स तत्र कृतावेशो भवति, तादृश यद् बुद्धि तत्त्वम्

प्रकाशावेशस्य = बुद्ध्यावन्तर्गतस्य प्रकाशः प्रतिबिंबस्य- न तु बिंबभूतस्य तटस्थस्य प्रकाशस्य

अर्थः = नीलादि पदार्थः

प्रकाशते = न केवलस्य बुद्धि तत्त्वस्य, तस्य जडत्वात्, नापि- पुरुषस्य, तस्योदासीनत्वात्

चितः = भोक्तुः यः प्रतिबिंबः - बुद्धितत्त्वे संक्रान्ति

तस्य योगः = संबन्धः

प्रतिसमाहितम् = प्रतिसमाधान विषयतां नीतम्

प्रतिबिंबकम् = आत्मचैतन्य प्रतिबिंबः on which the reflection falls becomes gradually as the original luminosity

तत् तर्हि.... the latter becomes nondifferent from Budhi. विरुद्धधर्माध्यासात् = जडायां बुद्धौ चैतन्य प्राप्त रूपात्

एतत् = प्रतिबिंब साधनम्

स एव = विरुद्धधर्माध्यास एव

जाज्वल्यमानम् = अत्यर्थं ज्वलत्

मुख्यप्रकाशरूपैव बुद्धिर्जाता = Thus Budhi becomes identical with original luminosity.

अर्थमयी = अर्थरूपा

एतस्याः = बुद्धेः

तद्रूपत्वम् = अर्थरूपत्वम्

वाच्यं = अवश्यं वक्तव्यम्

सर्वे = बुद्धिरेव

चिद्रूपस्यापि = चिद्रूपत्वेनाङ्गीक्रियमाणस्य बुद्धितत्त्वस्य

ज्ञानं नाम = ज्ञानाख्या, न हि शक्तिमलोऽभावे शक्ति युक्ति इति भावः

ज्ञानमात्रमेव न तु तत्कर्तृभूतो नित्य आत्मा अस्ति इति भावः

बोधः = निर्विकल्प ज्ञानम्

चैतन्यप्रतिबिम्बयोगे = If in consequence of the contact with the reflection of the sentient (पुरुषः), that which the self luminous subject is reflected (on Budhi) does not itself become sentient.

तेन .... = The reflection will serve no purpose.

इति पूर्वकारणपरम्परातः = Because of the already existing chain of causation (i.e. revival of the previous beginingless Vāsnā).

(But even the theory of reflection does not alter Saugata's view against the permanence of Self. He thinks that it is not possible for Bhudhi to receive reflection of Sentiency from a Source (Self) whose existence is not proved. With this idea in his mind he says:-).

Thus, the Budhi shall have to be admitted itself as sentient, for in an insentient thing there cannot be the capacity of making the objects manifest.

एवं ज्ञानं परीक्ष्य, क्रियां परीक्षते :-

क्रियाप्यर्थस्य कायादेस्तत्तद्देशादि-
जातता ।
नान्याऽदृष्टेर्न साप्येका क्रमिकैस्य चो-
चिता ॥९॥

योजना :- क्रिया अपि कायादेर् अर्थस्य, तत् तद्देशादि जातता, न अन्या, अदृष्टेः (प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्यामनुपलब्धेः) सा एका नि क्रमिका अपि च न एकस्य उचिता[2] ॥

क्रियापि कर्त्री कायादेरर्थस्य, आदि शब्देन परिणामादि क्रिया विषयस्य, दुग्धादेर्ग्रहणम्, तेन कायदुग्धादेः पदार्थस्य ते ते च ते देशादयः तेषु जातता — तद्वैशिष्ट्यकृतो अन्यः प्रादुर्भावो भवति, नवीनो न भवति! कुतः? अदृष्टेः प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्यामनुपलब्धेरिति ॥

Karika - (9)
page - 79.

"Action also is nothing else than the presence of such external things as body etc, at various places etc. For, nothing else is perceived."

In the perceptible movement, which, at the empirical level, is referred as "He goes", "He moves," "He falls" etc, we find nothing more than a certain form, such as Devdutta, which was at first at a place in the house, but subsequently is found at another place outside it. We do not perceive any thing more than this which may be called action. Similarly in the experience "Devdutta sits for a day" the form of Dev Datta, which was associated with the ~~X~~ morning time, is experienced as connected with another unit of time. In the experience "milk changes" that which was experienced as sweet & liquid, is experienced as sour & solid. Thus, the thing (the chain of momentary beings) itself appears associated with different times, places & forms. In spite of these differences (in associated space & time) recognition of the thing as the same is due to similarity; for instance, we recognise a person to be the same ev[illegible] when there is difference in body, hair and nail. When there are spatial and formal differences, the temporal difference.

P.T.O

is bound to be. Although all differences, temporal, spatial or formal are included in the formal, because space is nothing but form and temporal difference also involves the formal, yet from practical point of view they differ from one another. Therefore, the Budhas Baudhas speak of them separately. This is the substance of the verse (क्रिया)

Thus (any) 'action' is not directly perceived anywhere and because there is no direct perception, therefore, we cannot infer it either. For, inference depends upon the former (direct perception). And the effect, such as reaching the village etc., is non-different from the succeeding momentary existence of a particular time, thing and place. Therefore, it (Kriya) cannot be assumed for the reason that the effect is not possible without it. Thus, the statement "it is known through neither of the two means of right knowledge, direct perception and inference", asserts the absence of arguments to justify the assumption of 'action' (Kriya). Now he states also the reason ______ to refute it:—

Now he gives the negative proof as well.

(The following is the last part of verse no 9)

"The view that it (action) is one and successive and belongs to one (agent) is also not sound."

The priority or the posterity of moments is due to their unification by determinate cognition. Nothing in itself is priority or posterior. Each thing is only itself (has no priority or posteriority in itself). Therefore, the characteristic feature of action, which consists in succession the chain of the prior and the posterior, which is due to determinate cognition, does not refer to what is real. Every one of them (links of the chain) is ~~different~~ distinct from the rest. How then can action be represented to be one? Moreover, succession necessarily involves diversity. For, if there be no diversity there can be no succession either. Unity is opposite of diversity. How then can action be conceived as successive and one? Nor can it be said that it is one because of its residing in one. For there is no experience of the substratum different from the ~~moments~~ moments. The moments alone, coming in succession, are experienced. Moreover how can the substratum, being affected

P.T.O

by various moments of action, characterised by temporal, spatial and formal differences be spoken of as one? Hence, recognition, which is due to similarity, as expressed in "it is the same Devdatta, who has reached the village" is not sufficient to establish real unity (of Devdatta) (9)

Page 77. Kārikā 4.

The essential nature of remembrance is the shining of the object in it exactly in the manner in which it shone in direct experience. But if it does not shine in the same manner, distinctive feature of remembrance will be lost. Moreover in an error it is either the non-existing (असत्) according to असत्ख्यातिवादि or the particular that self assumes, (because of Vāsanā according to आत्मख्यातिवादिनः) that shines. The error therefore, does not grasp any object. For, the object does not shine in it. Thus, the object is not made so manifest by error as to become an object of action in practical life. The essence of व्यवस्थापना (right knowledge?) is such a manifestation of an object as can be useful in practical life. After the remembrance of an object, there arises desire for it, and action towards it follows. This will be impossible (if remembrance be simply an error and therefore, unable to make the object manifest). Moreover, if the object does not shine, its mere origin from the residual trace is assumed only to explained its similarity with the direct experience. But there is no same similarity whatsoever of the direct experience, whose characteristic feature is the manifestation of objects, with the error, called remembrance, ~~whose~~ which does not in any way touch i.e. has no relation with the external object.

(4)

Having examined the power of knowledge (ज्ञान शक्तिः), the Saugata now examines the power of Action (क्रिया शक्तिः) :

Eng : Action also belongs to objects like body etc, as it appears to be produced, as it were from them (objects) in their association with different places, time, + forms. for, nothing else is perceived.

The view that it (action) is one + successive and belongs to one (agent) is not also sound.

परिस्पंदरूपं = चेष्टा रूपं

प्रतिभासगोचरम् = प्रतिभास विषयीभूतम्. (यही जो ज्ञान विषय है)

तत्र = तस्मिन् प्रतिभासे

तत्स्वरूप व्यतिरिक्तं = देवदत्तस्वरूप व्यतिरिक्तम्

प्रतीम: = विद्म:, देशोपहितां क्रियां प्रदर्श्य कालोपहितां प्रदर्शयति।

उपाहित: = संमिलित, सम्मिलित - पहना संबंध, हुवा

आकारोपहितां क्रियां प्रदर्शयति "दुग्धम्" इति.

भाव एव = देवदत्तकाय दुग्धादिरूप पदार्थक्षण एव —

ननु तर्हि कथं सोऽयमिति प्रत्यभिज्ञा दृश्यते - आह "सादृश्य" इति

or ननु सोऽयमिति प्रत्यभिज्ञानमेकत्रैव युक्तं, न देशादिना व्यवहिते — इति अत्र आह "सादृश्य"॥

प्रत्यभिज्ञा = सोयं देवदत्त इत्यादिरूपं प्रत्यभिज्ञानम्॥

"नखादौ" इति, प्रतिक्षणं भिन्नापि हि दीपशिखा सादृश्यात्सेयमिति प्रत्यभिज्ञायते। ननु कथमेकस्य देवदत्तकायरूपस्य भावस्य देशकालभेदेन भिन्नत्वे येन भेदप्राण सादृश्यनिमित्तक प्रत्यभिज्ञाविषयत्वं कथयसि — आह "देशकारइति"

तु- यथार्थे, देशाकारान्यत्वे = देशाकारयोर्भिन्नत्वे, यथा "कालान्यत्वमवश्यंभावावि" = नहि देवदत्तस्य गृहे बहिश्चावचावस्थाने युगपत् संभवति, दुग्धादेव दध्याद्यवस्था, तथा "देशकालान्यत्वेऽपि", अर्थादाकारान्यत्वमवश्यंभावि भवति विशेषणकृतभेदाश्रयणात्, दृश्यते च नीलसितोत्पलयोर्विशेषणकृतो भेद इति न कोऽपि विरोधः, आकारभेदे तद्भेदः स्फुटतर एवेति नात्र काप्यनुपपत्तिः, कालाकारभेदेन अवश्यं देशभेद इति तदकथनम्, देशकालान्यत्वेऽप्याकारान्यत्वमिति वा पाठः

See also Note 50-55 the IPV page 81-82

स्वरूपस्यैव = मूर्तेरेव,

पर्यवस्यन्ति = विश्राम्यन्ति, तथा स्थूलदृष्ट्या = आपातदृष्ट्या

तदभावात् ..... अनुमानेन = When a thing has not directly perceived before, inference cannot be applied.

अतः कारणात्, बौद्धैः - बुद्धितत्त्वविश्रान्तैः - वादिभिः ते भेदेनोच्यन्ते = आकारस्य आकारे पर्यवसाने राहोः शिर इति वत् ज्ञेयम - अत्र च देशस्य भानादेव आकारत्वे साधितमिति न काप्यनुपपत्तिरित्युपसंहारं करोति - "एवम् इति"

कार्यान्यथा ...... Therefore Kriya cannot be assumed for the reason that effect is not possible without it.

तत् पूर्वकेण = प्रत्यक्षपूर्वकेण,

आदि शब्देन कालस्य ग्रहणम् -

सा = क्रिया, कल्प्या = कल्पयितुं शक्या

प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम् = प्रत्यक्षानुमान भावेन, साधकप्रमाणस्य अभावः तस्या = क्रियायाः।

तत्र = तस्यां क्रियायाम्, पूर्वापररूपता = पूर्वापरीभावः

The priority and posteriority of moments is due to unificatory by determinate cognition. By himself posterior & prior moment is nothing.

क्षणानाम् = क्रियाक्षणानाम्, विकल्पबुद्ध्यानुसंधानात् विकल्पज्ञानसंपादितेनानुसंधानेन

⊕ न स्वक्यं वास्तवं..... = is not sufficient to establish real unity (aparopa...)

किंचित् = कोऽपि क्षणः   वस्तुमात्रम् = पूर्वापरभावास्पर्शि वस्तु-स्वरूपमात्रम्

तत् = सन्तत्या वर्तमानो यथा स्वक्षण समूहः

किंचित् क्षणम् = क्रियायाः किमपि क्षणम्, वस्तु = वस्तुभूतम्
बौद्धमते क्षणमेव वस्तुत्वात् सन्ततेस्तु वैकल्पिकत्वात्,

ते हि क्षणा न..... "न स्पृशन्ति", न हि विकल्पसिद्धयोः पारमार्थिकयोऽन्योन्यं संबन्धो युक्तः।
= Every one of them (links of the chain) is distinct from the rest.

स्वरूपाविष्टाः = स्वरूपश्लेष युक्ताः, प्रत्येकं स्वकालमात्रे स्थितत्वात्, अन्यथा क्षणत्वायोगात्

Therefore how can action be represented to be one. ← इति = अतः कारणात्, एका = क्षणसन्ततिरूपा -

क्रमो हि भेदेन..... = Succession necessarily involves diversity
एकत्वं प्रत्याख्याय तदवष्टंभेन क्रमिकत्वमपि समुच्चयेन प्रत्याख्यातुमाह "क्रमो हि" इति

अभिन्ने.... = For in absence of succession diversity there can be no succession either.
तदभावात् = क्रमाभावात्, न हि व्यापकाभावे व्याप्यसत्ता युक्ता इति भावः
भेदस्य विरुद्धम् ऐक्यम् = unity is opposite of diversity.

इति कथं.... = How can action be conceived as successive and one.
तत्क्षणातिरिक्ताः = तेभ्यः क्षणेभ्योऽतिरिक्ताः
For there is no experience of the आश्रयः different from the moments.

अपि.... = Nor can it be said that it is one because of its residing in one.
प्रबन्धवृत्तयः = अविच्छिन्नस्थितयः
Moments alone, coming in succession are experienced

आश्रयः = देवदत्तकायादिरूपः

⊕

अतो विकल्पप्राणितं..... = Therefore the characteristic feature of action (क्रियाया लक्षणं च), which consists in succession in chain of posterior + prior moments (पूर्वापरीभूतत्वे क्रमरूपतया) is due to determinate cognition (विकल्प प्राणितं) - does not refer to any what is real (न वस्तु किंचित् स्पृशतीत्यर्थः)।

तत्र तत्र स्थिते तत्तद्भवतीत्येव दृश्यते ।
नान्यन्नान्योऽस्ति संबन्धः, कार्यकारणभावतः ॥१०॥

योजना:- तत्र तत्र स्थिते तत् तद् भवति इति एव दृश्यते न अन्यत् (क्रिया) कार्यकारण भावतः, अन्य संबन्धः नास्ति'॥

तत्र तत्र - तस्मिन् तस्मिन् मृत्पिंडादिरूपे भावक्षणे सति, तत्तत् - स्तूयकादिरूपः स स भावक्षणोऽस्ति, इत्येव- एतावन्मात्रमेव दृश्यते, अन्यत - अतो व्यतिरिक्तं कार्यकारणरूपं किंचिन्न दृश्यते। ननु कार्यकारणभाव- व्यतिरिक्तो अन्यः कोऽपि संबन्धो भवतु, इत्यत आह, "नान्योऽस्ति" इति, कार्य कारण भावतो अन्यः संबन्धो नास्ति, तस्यायुक्तत्वात् इति भावः)

T. Having thus examined both the power of knowledge & power of action, the Saugata now refutes the relation that may be supposed to exist between them & the Self, so that by attributing these two powers to him, he may be said to be Omniscient & Omnipotent.

Only this much is perceived that certain things exist before and the other things come into being later & according to Saugata's view there is no relation other than that of Cause & effect (The Saugata means to say that even this relation cannot exist between knowledge or Action & the Self for

(the apparent reason)2

Karika (10) page 83.

(10) "Only this much is perceived that certain things being existent other things come into being. There is no other relation than that of cause and effect".

The pilloret comes into existence when the clay is already there & so small Śiva-like form Śivika must be preceded by the pilloret and so on till the jar comes into being. In this case we perceive only momentary existences (of various stages of clay in being a jar) and nothing more such a relation is directly perceived or inferred. Thus all that has been said in connection with action can be repeated in this connection also. The same is the way of refuting all kinds of relations such as that of container and the contained etc. For, after the separate momentary existences of bowl and jujube fruit, there is the rise of distinct momentary existence characterised by absence of intervening space between the bowl and the fruit of jujube. And regular precedence and succession of two things is distinctly spoken

P.T.O

of as relation of Cause and effect in practical life.

But there is no relation of Cause and effect between Knowledge or action and the Self. For, the latter cannot be spoken of as the effect of the former. Because, the Knowledge is the effect of the things necessary for its rise and there because there is no separate thing called action, there is, therefore, no connection of Self with either Knowledge or action. Hence it cannot be represented to be doer or Knower (10).

द्वित्वसंख्या रूप

अवतरनिका :- एवं ज्ञान क्रिये परीक्ष्य तद्योगात् सेश्वर्यम् - इत्यत्र हेतौ योगशब्द वाच्यं संबन्धांश परीक्षितुं संबन्धे तावत् साधकं प्रमाणम् नास्ति ॥

यस्मिन सति = यस्मिन संबन्धे

ते सवन्द्वे = ज्ञान क्रिया शक्तिः का संबन्ध

ते संबन्धं = उस संबन्ध को , ध्वंसयितुं = तिरस्कार करने के लिए

तावत् = प्रथमम् , यस्मिन् संबन्धे सति

तत् विषये = संबन्ध विषयम् ,

प्रमाण अभावे = साधकं प्रमाणम् नास्ति ॥

When the clay is already there, pillarette comes into being.

मृत्पिण्डे = मिट्टी का पिण्ड (घट का कारण) सति = उस के होने पर

स्तूपकः = फिर चक्की पर चढाकर यह मृत्-पिण्ड स्तूप-आकार बनता है

(घट निर्माणार्थं उपात्तस्य मृत्पिण्डस्य कुलालेन प्रथमं क्रियमाणो रचना विशेषः), ✓

शिवकः = ऊपर चढाना चक्की पर, उन्नतवस्तु रूपो रचना विशेषः

In this case we perceive only momentary existence (of various stages of clay in making a jar.

यावत् घटः = घट भावे तावत् अवस्थायीत्यर्थः

इत्येवं = अनेन प्रकारेण, भावक्षणा एव = स्तूपकादि रूपा पदार्थक्षणा एव

केवल यह घटाकार

and nothing more than this relation is directly perceived or inferred.

न अधिकं किंचित् = घटकारण तथा स्थितं,

as we have said about Action

क्रियायामिव वाच्यम् = यथा क्रियानिर्णये उक्तम्

प्रत्यक्षं न कापि क्रियाऽस्ति तत एव तत्पूर्वकेण अनुमानेन

You are blind Mr Buddha

ननु किं कार्यकारण भाव एव अयं न्याय उत सर्वत्र, अपि"

आह — "सर्वत्र" इति , पन्था = मार्गः , सरणिः (तम एव दर्शयति)

The same is the way for refuting all kinds of relations such as that of container and contained.

do not see the potter - you see earth only. Sorry for you

अन्योन्य-
संयुक्तः ← निरन्तरात्मकः = संबन्धरूपः , ननु तर्हि कथं कार्यकारण-
भाव प्रसिद्धिरस्तीत्यत आह -

∴ अयमेव च भावः = मृत्पिण्डादिरूपः पदार्थ एव,
भावान्तरेण सह = घटादिरूपेणान्येन पदार्थेन सह
विकल्पेन = विकल्प बुद्धि पूर्वापरतया = पूर्वापर भावेन, मृदः पूर्वत्वात् घटस्य
परत्वात् इति भावः
ननु अयमेव संबन्धः आत्मनोऽपि कर्तृत्व ज्ञातृत्वाभ्यां
सह भवतीत्यत आह - "न च"

तत्कार्यत्वस्वभावात्
→ संतान रूपस्य
∴ स्वसामग्रीकार्यत्वात् = अलौकिकेन्द्रियादिरूप -
निज सामग्री कार्यत्वात्
∴ - परोक्षमिति दृष्टादि
यतः यस्मात ज्ञान क्रिया संबन्धात् । → Knowledge is the effect of the things necessary for its rise.

प्रथग्रूप कुण्डबदरक्षणानन्तरे = For, after the separate momentary existences of bowl + बेर (jujube fruit),
क्षणानन्तरे = there is the rise of distinct momentary existence
निरन्तरात्मक = characterised by absence of intervening space
विशिष्ट कुण्डबदरोदयः → between the bowl + the बेर
∴ - And regular precedence and succession of two things is determinately spoken as of as relation of cause + effect in practical life.

page 87

Karika (11)

(11) ("There is nothing like relation (sambandha) apart from momentary existences;) because (1) that which exists in two must have multiplicity of forms. (2) The accomplished (Sidha), however, needs none, (3) nor is it related to another by relation of dependence. Therefore, (4) the relation of Self with action as its agent is a mere supposition."

Relation as generally defined, is nothing else than the interconnection of two things, which are mutually connected. It is a unity. But how is that possible? For, what is present in the entirety of its being at one place, cannot also be present at another, because that involves change in form. Thus, conjunction, inherence and other relations, dependent upon them, should be considered to have been refuted.

And the relation of dependence among the sentients and, through transference, among the insentients, of which we talk in our practical life, is also not possible, because what is accomplished (Sidha) cannot be said to be dependent, because of the very fact of its being accomplished (Sidha).

P.T.O

But what is not so, and therefore has no indivi-duality, cannot at all be said to ~~be dependent~~ have any dependence. The same can be said in regard to the relation, called [illegible]. Moreover how can the two forms be united? For, two cannot become one; but if they do so, how can there be any relation; (because they have become one & the relation requires two to exist). Therefore, just knower is a mere supposition and not real, so is the doer also. This is the prima facie view. (11).

Positive Proof — Argument against negative proofs

Arguments in Support ← प्रमाणम् = साधकमिति भावः, बाधकम् = बाधकं प्रमाणम्,
सामान्यम् = सामान्यलक्षणम्, विशेषः = विशेषलक्षणम्.
in general terms — general quality — in special terms specially
त्योमुखेन — द्वारेण.

द्विष्ठस्यानेकरूपत्वात् सिद्धस्यान्यानपेक्षणात् ।
पारतन्त्र्याद्ययोगात् च, तेन कर्तापि कल्पितः ॥१२॥

(Marginal: Relationship needs two existence; Relation between 2 objects are various many; स्वातन्त्र्य; क्रमाक्रम)

योजना :- (संबन्धः) द्विष्ठः (द्वि-स्थः), (स) अनेकरूपत्वात् (न चैकेनात्मना उभयत्र स्थितिर्युक्ता); सिद्धस्य अन्य अनपेक्षणात् (न च द्वयोः सिद्धयोरन्योऽन्यापेक्षा) पारतन्त्र्यादि-योगाच्च (नापि स्वात्ममात्रनिष्ठयोः पारतन्त्र्यसंबन्धः), तेन कर्तापि कल्पितः (तेन यथा ज्ञातृत्वं कल्पितं तथा कर्तृत्वम् अपि इति- कथम् आत्मा सर्वेश्वर इति) ॥

(Marginal: Connection between 2 — relation is interrelation means interaction initiated by some combining force called the actor. Now Bodha refutes the Actor. The दृश्यमान the Proof by arguments.)

Having thus refuted the arguments in support of the relation that may be be supposed to exist between the powers of knowledge + action + the Self, the Sangata now argues against it in general as well as in special terms.

(Marginal: 3 arguments (false arguments) Eng: (1) what acts & depends on 2 must be द्विष्ठ — many. As unity is one but what is 2 is multiplicity so it cannot be unity & one. ...)

As a rule relationship refers to two things; & that which exists in two must have multiplicity of forms. (It is not right to think that one Atma is connected with both in relation). An established thing (i.e. a thing having independent existence - Sidha) does not need another (अन्यान्यपेक्षा) — Nor is it related to another by relation of dependence (पारतन्त्र्य). Therefore just as Knower is a mere supposition + not real, so is the Actor also.

Relation is defined as nothing else then inter connection of two things.

सबन्धस्तावत् = संबन्ध क्या होता है, परस्पर प्राप्तिरूपो = आपस का मेल

द्वयो = दो का, प्राप्तिभाजो = कुण्डबदरादिरूपयोः

(which are mutual connected) तन्तुपटादिरूपयोश्च परस्परप्रवेशभाजो: विषये

एकः = एकरूपः, सामान्यलक्षणे = प्रकृतत्वात् संबन्धस्य

तत् च = सामान्यलक्षणश्च, (It is unity)

कथं = इह न संभवतीत्यर्थः। (But how is that possible) एकत्र = एकस्मिन वस्तुनि कुण्डादिरूपे तन्त्वादिरूपे वा

एतेन ..... नन्तव्याः — Therefore conjunction, inherence & other relations, dependent upon them, should be considered to have been refuted.

तन्मूलाश्च = संयोगसमवायमूलाः

अन्येऽपि = कार्यकारणभावादयः संबन्धाः

धुरम् = अवस्थाम्, सामान्यमुखेन निरूप्य विशेषमुखेनापि निरूपयति "योऽपि" इति

तत्कल्पनया = चेतन कल्पनया

पारतन्त्र्यात्मा = अन्योन्यपारतन्त्र्यरूपः interdependance

तत्र = तस्मिन् संबन्धे, सिद्धस्य = चेतनस्य

सिद्धत्वादेव = न हि सिद्धस्य पारतन्त्र्यं युक्तम असिद्धत्वापातात् इति भावः

असिद्धस्य = अचेतनस्य, नतराम् = अतिशयेन नास्तीत्यर्थः (which has no individuality) (Cannot at all be said to have any dependence.)

एवम् = पारतन्त्र्यवत्

अपेक्षायाम् = सूत्रे आदिशब्दगृहीते अपेक्षारूपे संबन्धे. (The same can be said in regard to the relation 'अपेक्षा'.)

द्वे च = कुण्डबदरादिरूपे तन्तुपटादिरूपे वा,

कथं श्लिष्यतो = किस तरह संबन्ध हो सकता है — How can be two united?

तस्मात = तेन, इत्यनेन व्याख्या

न वस्तु = परमार्थभूतो न भवति

For two can not become one. For if they do how can there be any relation.

तस्मात् ज्ञानसंबन्धात् .... "कर्ता" इति कल्पनामात्रम्!

अनुभव विकल्पन स्मरणादि ज्ञानमालैव अस्ति, न तु ज्ञाता कश्चित् — इत्यर्थस्यं प्राक् प्रसाधितत्वात्, एवं क्रियाऽभावात् कर्तापि कल्पितः – इति क्रियाकारकादीनां तावन्मात्र लक्षणस्य उपकल्पितत्वात्, कथं आत्मा सर्वेश्वरः, के ज्ञान क्रिये, तदभावात् कथमैश्वर्य व्यवहारसिद्धिः – इति धर्मि हेत्वसिद्धिं समर्थयता सिद्धान्त्युक्तस्य ऐश्वर्यव्यवहारसिद्धौ स्वभावहेतोरभावे वदता बौद्धेन "ज्ञान संततिमात्रमेऽऽत्मा" इति ~~प्रसह्य~~ प्रसाधितम् ॥

कार्यकारणभावश्च न अत्र संगतः, तथाहि आत्मा न तावत् न कार्यः, ज्ञानम् अपि विषयेन्द्रियमनस्कारादेर्भवेत् न आत्मानं कारणीकुर्यात् ॥

*. For what is present in the entirety of its being at one place, cannot also be present at another, for it involves change in the form.

*: Second argument.

An established Sidha can create according to his desire without any relation of 2. relation means action of an actor. So as the Sidha can create without relation it means in this the general actor is only a supposition.

Third: dependance on 2 means one is dependant on the other. But the Atma according to Shaivism is Swatantra but All action is one thing becoming another so complete independance is not there: Atma cannot ... dependant. Hence an independant ... is a myth.

अथ तृतीयमाह्निकम् ।

(Shiva the ultimate cause of everything.)

विना येन न किंचित्स्यात्, समस्ता अपि दृष्टयः ।
अनस्तमित संबोधस्वरूपं तं स्तुमः शिवम् ॥ (1)

Ever present. In the prima facie (state) — Never non-existant — of the form of understanding — see next page bottom

येन = उत्तरार्धे वक्ष्यमाण स्वरूपेन उपादानभूतेन, विना,

समस्ता अपि = नीलसुखादि रूप बाह्याभ्यन्तर भाव विषयाः,

दृष्टयः = परिमित ज्ञानानि

किंचित् = वस्तु , न स्यात् = मृदा विनेव घटादयो न भवेयुः

कथं तम्, अनस्मित, यथा तथा कल्पितस्य स्वान्तस्यापि
साक्षिरूपतया स्थितत्वात्

यः संबोधः = विषयोपराग रहितं शुद्ध ज्ञानम्, (desireless, understanding)

स्वम = अन्यानुयायी रूपम् - स्थितिर्यस्य तादृशम्

शिवम् = प्रकाश रूपं (सुख और कल्याण दायक).

स्तुमः = स्वाभीष्ट सिद्धये स्तुतिद्वारेण परामृशामः ॥

एतस्मिन् पूर्वपक्षे .... = जो इन सात श्लोकों से
पूर्वपक्ष ने बतलाया है। कि स्मृतिः
संस्कार मात्र से ही सिद्ध है

तदेव दूषयितुं =
उसी को दूषित करने के लिए to disprove that theory

ननु क्रियायाः संबन्धस्य च यन्निराकरणं कृतं तत् किन्न दूष्यते
येन "तदेव"

क्रियायां संबन्धे च = कि क्रिया के साथ किसी अनित्य
आत्मा का संबन्ध नहीं है जो ऐसा दोष
बौद्ध ने चढाया ॥

दूषणोद्धरणं = दोष को हटाना ,
वह हम दूसरे क्रिया अधिकार में बतलायेंगे ॥

In the prima facie view (stated in the preceding Ahnika) it was held that remembrance is possible from mere residual trace (यतो हि पूर्वानुभवः संस्कारात् उपहितस्य संभवः). To refute this the Author puts in the following 7 Shlokas beginning with "सत्यं" & ending in ज्ञानस्मृत्यपोहन शक्तिमान्. The criticism of action & relation will be answered in the second book entitled Kriya Kanda. The refutation of the conception of cognition (ज्ञान:) as different from Self, as admitted by Kanada & the Sankhya systems, is in full agreement with the view of the Author. Therefore, it is a refutation of a different type.

The first 2 verses[1&2] prove that though remembrance may be admitted to be a residual trace, yet it cannot illumine the former direct cognition, because luminosity of every cognition is self-confined. Then in the next two[3&4] verses having raised the question whether remembrance is illusory knowledge & answered it, in the third verse by the way, he removes the misapprehension that all determinate cognitions are illusory. Then he states in a verse[5] that, remembrance being impossible even if there be residual trace, the practical life

will come to an end. In the next verse he shows how it is possible on the basis of his theory. This is the summary. Now begins the explanation of the text.

यत्तु = जो अब , परेण = शाक्येन , व्यतिरिक्तं = आत्मा से भिन्न

तदभिमतमेव ग्रन्थकृतः = उत्पलदेव को यह बात भाती है

जो

शाक्यमतमाश्रित्य काणादशास्त्रे सांख्यशास्त्रे च चात्मव्यतिरिक्तं ज्ञानं निरास्तं तद्दूषणं अभीष्टत्वेन

तत् दूषणान्तमेव = वह दूषण वह मानता है जो पसन्द करता है ।।

अभीष्टत्वेन प्रतिसमाधानयोग्यभ्यो दूषणेभ्यो

श्रीशिव नयेऽपि ज्ञानस्यात्म व्यतिरिक्तम् ॥ शक्तित्वेन तदव्यतिरिक्तत्वाभावात् इति भावः ॥

तत्र = इन सात श्लोकों में , श्लोकद्वयेन = पहिले और दूसरे

ज्ञानस्य = सामान्यतया स्थितस्य समस्त बोध जातस्य , से

अनुभवस्य = विशेषतया स्थितस्य अनुभवाख्य ज्ञानस्य ,

स्मृतौ अप्रकाशत्वम् = स्मृत्या प्रकाशाभावः , स्मृति अनुभव को नहीं देख पाती ॥

स्मृतेः भ्रान्तित्वम् = स्मृतिः में भ्रान्ति भाव का होना , जैसे कि "वह , यह है कि नहीं" ऐसी भ्रान्ति ॥

प्रसङ्गात् = बात में बात कही जानी

सर्वाध्यवसायानाम् = विकल्प निश्चय रूप ,

स स्मृत्यनुपपत्तौ = यदि स्मृतिः न उपपद्

तदुपपत्ति = व्यवहारोपपत्तिः

We bow to that Shiva, without whom no experience is possible & who is everlastingly ever-shining and unaffected consciousness.

The Saiva-atma vadin refutes the Saugata's (Buddhist) reasoning against the doctrine that there exists a permanent Subject (Self) :-

∴ indicates :- There is much in the substance of the prima facie view which has to be accepted by me. But what is not acceptable is going to be refuted.

सत्यं किन्तु स्मृतिज्ञानं पूर्वानुभवसंस्कृतेः ।
जातमप्यात्मनिष्ठं तन्नाद्यानुभववेदकम् ॥२॥

योजना :- सत्यम्, किन्तु स्मृतिज्ञानं पूर्वानुभवसंस्कृतेः जातम् अपि, आत्मनिष्ठं, आद्य अनुभव-वेदकम् तत् न (भवति)[2] ॥

Eng :- True (I quite agree with certain points stated in the prima facie). Although, it may be admitted, that remembrance arises out of the residual trace of the former perception, yet being Self-confined (as every ~~every~~ cognitive experience is), it cannot make the former perception known i.e. remembrance has no scope to cognise directly the former percep-

[margin:] इत्येतद् "किंतु" here = This is इत्येन विशेषाभिधायिनी = What he indicates by the use of word "किंतु" (but), which indicates the difference.

तत् दूष्यते = तत् मया दूष्यते, विशेषाभिधायिनी = इस ~~शब्द~~ से अपने मत की विशेषता जतलाई ॥

इह = इस ~~स~~ शास्त्र में

स्मृतौ = ~~स्मृति में~~ = स्मृतिः

[margin:] इह = Here in the case of remembrance the point to be established is not the shining (consciousness) of the sense object, which is possible from the residual traces,

विषयमात्रस्य = घटविषय का ~~मात्र~~ जो पूर्व अनुभव घटविषय

प्रकाशः = भान, वेद्यः होना

न समर्थनी = समर्थ नहीं है

संस्कारादेव सिद्ध्येत् = या संस्कार ही से केवल स्मृत्य ज्ञान सिद्ध हो सके जैसे बौद्ध ने कहा -

but the point which requires explanation [illegible] indicated the illumination of the (former) perception [illegible]

→ have that form of remembrance, which is represented by the word "that" (तत्) and how without such a remembrance ~~can there be~~

various practi- अनुभव प्रकाशेन विना = पूर्वानुभव संवेदनेन विना ,

cal movements कथं ~~कथं~~स्यात् = तत् विषयेणैव विषयवत्त्वान्न स्याद् इति भावः

which are dependent, तया विना = "सः" विना (स्मृत्या) — तत् इति एवं रूपा स्मृत्या

upon desire. "कथं न स्यात्" अभिलाषेण व्यवहारः - कांक्षया क्रियमाणः पदार्थव्यवहारः ।

For, the effort for getting कुतो न स्याद् इति आह — "अनुभवेन" इति

a thing as the means of अस्य = व्यवहारविषयस्य भावस्य ① is always consequent upon the ascertainment of the things the means of pleasure through the

ततः = सुखसाधनता निश्चयानन्तरम्, बहुकालेन इति अर्थः

pleasure [illegible] the experience. ~~प ठत~~ उपादानम् = ग्रहणम्, तस्यैव ~~भा~~ भावस्य इति अर्थः

Here the [illegible] (अत्र च मध्ये स्मृतिरवश्यमाश्रयणीया, न हि सुखसाधनता स्मृत्यभावे कोऽपि भावस्योपादानं करोति)

former experience ननु पूर्वानुभववेदनमपि तत्र उपादानपर्यन्तकार्यवत् संस्कारादेव

explains how remembrance, जायताम् इति आह — "तत्र" इति

though not [illegible] पूर्वानुभवः — सुखसाधनता निश्चयः, तेन जनितात्

[illegible] संस्कारात् — सुखसाधनता संस्कारात् —

object. [illegible] that (object) एतावत् = उपादानपर्यन्तं कार्यं जातम्, न तु पूर्वानुभव-वेदनम् इति भावः

the object. [illegible] useful [illegible] ननु तत् स्मृतिज्ञानं किंविषयमित्यत आह — "यद्यपि" इति

has remembrance as knowledge विषयेण = पूर्वानुभवविषयेण, पुरःस्थत्वाभावाद् इति भावः

being itself [illegible] तथापि तद्विषयम् = पूर्वानुभूतविषयम्, संवेद्यमानस्य अप्रत्याख्येयत्वाद् इति भावः

manifested [illegible] inferred [illegible] एतावता = तद्विषयेण विषयवत्त्वेन (स्वीकार करना)

and the [illegible] its former [illegible] न किंचित् = किमपि न सम्पन्नम्, स्वप्रकाशज्ञाने = स्मृतिज्ञाने

विषयस्यैव = विषय की नहीं होता है → उसका प्रकाशन है ।। ग्राह्यस्य = आद्यस्य , अप्रकाशात् = अस्फुरणात्

as it does to object.

* अनुभवविषयत्वेन अवभासाभावात् स्मरणादभिलाषेण या प्रवृत्तिरुपादानादिका सा न स्यात् । पूर्वानुभवस्य यो विषयः तेन यदि स्मृविषय एकतां नीयते तदासौ उपपद्यते । तथा हि कपित्थमवलो~~कन~~क्य सुखसाधनमिदम् इति स्मृत्वा उपादत्ते, सुखं च पूर्वानुभवैकलग्नमस्यां स्मृतौ न किंचिदस्ति ।।

संस्कारजत्वात् = पूर्वानुभवसंस्कारोत्पन्नत्वात्

ग्राह्यम् = ग्राह्यम् - विषयीकुरुतां स्मृतिः-

स्मृत्य उसको विषय करे

ननु मा भूत परविषयस्य स्वीकारो, यस्तु संस्कारमहिमोपन-तोऽथात्मसिद्धश्च मम अनुभवोऽभवम् - इति स्मृतानुभवस्य अवभासः स किं न अङ्गीक्रियते ?

The Saugata questions with regard to this point. He says, because remembrance originates from residual traces, it will have to be admitted that remembrance has the former perception also as its object, viz. it has direct cognition of the former experience. Shaiva-dharma vādin there fore says:

But it may be argued that the remembrance because of its having originated from residuals has the former experience also as its object. To this the Author replies.

(1) दृक्, स्वाभासैव | (2) नान्येन, वेद्या, रूपदृशेव दृक् ।

(3) रसे | संस्कारजत्वं, तु तत्तुल्यत्वं न तद्गतिः ॥२॥

योजनाः- दृक् (ज्ञानम्) स्व-आभास एव (स्वप्रकाश एव भवति)॥ अन्येन वेद्याः न (भवति), (का इव?) रूप-दृशा रसे दृक् इव (यथा रसे दृक् रूपदृशा वेद्या न भवति तथा); (स्मृतेः पूर्वानुभव) संस्कारजत्वं तु तत्तुल्यत्वं (पूर्वानुभव तुल्यत्वम भवति); न तु तद्गतिः (पूर्वानुभव अवगति न भवति) ॥.

Eng:- perception is self-luminous (दृग्-स्वाभास), it cannot be the object of any other experience

(1)

Page no 34. Karika (2).

Tika :- Here the word 'ज्ञा' means 'Cognition' (experience). It is different from the insentient, in as much as it is essentially Self-manifest in its nature. Therefore the insentient has to be spoken of as different from the sentient. Hence cognition is self-manifest i.e. manifestedness is its never-failing quality; or its essential quality is to make itself alone manifest. Even if there be external objects, still the luminosity of (ज्ञान:) as falling or reflected on the forms of external objects, cannot be rightly maintained to be the essential nature of cognition (ज्ञान:)। For, self luminosity of cognition consists in making itself so manifest as to make others also manifest (and not in casting be its light on another and 'shining in another').

But while not the direct experience, being self-manifest in itself, shine in remembrance? 'No', because one cognition is to not to be made manifest by another. For, if one cognition were to shine in another it would cease to be self-manifest. This is the chief characteristic of the self-manifest (that it shines in itself only). If it be so, there being no connection with any other in so far as it does not shine in another, how can the use of the locative which dependents on the relation, (of the containing & the contained) be justifiable in regard to it?

Because of this (that one cognition does not shine in another) it is that by the cognition of colour the cognition of taste is not made manifest. For, if one cognition were to make another cognition manifest, taste also would be virtually perceived by the eye.

But if the direct experience does not shine in remembrance, what then is the purpose served

P.T.O.

by the residual trace? Of course there is no cognition of colour from the residual trace of taste; How can this objection stand? Therefore residual trace itself will remove the objection, raised by you.

No, because the knowledge called remembrance has risen from a later cognition, (the cognition of a similar object) as associated with the residual trace, left by former experience; therefore it may be similar to it (in point of having the same thing for its object as was that of the first experience) just as the position of a branch, left after having been drawn, becomes similar to what it was before. But it is not right to suppose that whatever is produced by residual trace (of former experience) that is essentially a manifester of the that experience. Moreover, how can there be consciousness of similarity? For, neither direct experience nor remembrance produces consciousness of similarity. They do not shine in each other. Therefore, the consciousness of point of similarity, present in both, is impossible: & there is nothing else capable of knowing both. Thus, residual trace can make objective reference possible in remembrance, but it can not make the direct experience an object of experience, nor can it arouse the consciousness that the object of remembrance is the object of former experience. This is undeniable.

(2) knowledge of B." When somebody sees an object say a flower - He by dint of the residual trace does recall the memory

Say remembrance (नान्येन वेद्यः) just as the perception of Colour cannot be the object of perception of taste (रूप-दृष्टा रसे दृक्) The fact that remembrance arises from residual trace only makes it similar to the former performer perception (ie direct experience in respect of having the same object (तत् तुल्यार्थ) but the former perception does not come within the range of remembrance (न तत् गतिः). See remembrance there is no direct cognition of the former perception (न तदवगतिः). In fact the former perception does not shine in remembrance, ie the experience of former perception does not occur in the later remembrance, but the latter has only the similarity or likeness of the former (तदसदृश्यमात्रम्) ||

(1) Understanding is self knowing only. An engineer is not a lawyer. Perception of sight does not become perception of hearing. A blind man can hear but not see. So it is limited to what has been perceived. Knowledge of A does not mean knowledge of B.

"दृक्" — ज्ञानम्, तत् च = वह ज्ञान् — pictures — jडात्= शेयाख्यात् — as much as it is essentially self manifest in nature

It is different from insentient जडवस्तुनः, व्यतिरेकेणाख्येतदेव साधयति - "जडो हि" इति

वक्तव्यः = वक्तुम् योग्यः Therefore insentient has to be spoken different from sentient.

प्रकाशमानता = बाह्य संबन्ध प्रकाश कर्तृत्वम् — manifestedness

अव्यभिचारि = अन्यानुयायि, — is its never failing quality or its essential quality is to make itself alone manifest. — स्व = स्वरूपभूतः आभासो यस्या सा स्वाभास इति सामानाधिकरण्येन विग्रहो H कार्यः ||

स्वस्य = दृगाख्यस्य आत्मनः, आभासनम् = आभासः

रूपम् = स्वरूपं यस्या स इति

सत्यपि = परमार्थविचारे बाह्यमेव नास्तीत्यपि प्रकाशाभिप्रायः, — Even if there be external objects..

तच्छरीर संक्रान्तम् = बाह्यस्वरूप लग्नम्, तदुपरक्तम् इति यावत्।

प्रकाशनम् = प्रकाशः, ननु किं तस्य स्वरूपम् इति आह- 'पर'

परप्रकाशात्मकम् = बाह्य प्रकाशरूपं यत्, निजम् = स्वम्-रूपेण इति

स्वस्य प्रकाशनम् — प्रकाशः — Self luminosity of cognition consists in making it self manifest as to make others also manifest. & not casting its light on another and shining in another.

(4) of the flower after say one two or 3 years. But the process of knowing the flower was not the object

- तदैव न तु तत्र कर्तृत्वम्, ज्ञानस्य स्वप्रकाशत्वं नाम स्वरूपम् इति दोषः

भण्यते = कथ्यते — तथा नात्मस्पर्शी स्फुरत एव अस्तामिति भावः

ननु स्वाभासमेव सत् = स्वाभास होते हुए ही—

तत् अनुभवज्ञाने = वह अनुभवाख्य ज्ञान Memory of taste is

स्मरणे भासिष्यते = स्मृतिः में भासन में आये - यानी स्मृतिः उसे विषयः करे not physical taste.

न = नही ऐसा नही हो सकता.

"नान्येन वेद्या" इति = ज्ञान एक दूसरे को विषय नही करते — अनुभव ज्ञान किसी दूसरे ज्ञान से विषयः नही होसकता—

परत्र = दूसरे से — अगर वह भासन में आवे

सा = एक — कुतो न सा स्वाभासा — इदमेव = यही तो है

स्वरूपस्य लक्षणः = स्वाभासस्य असाधारण धर्मः॥

स्वयम् यदि .... = प्रथमं तस्य स्वयं प्रकाशरूपत्वेन प्रकाशापेक्षा नास्ति —

यदि तु प्रकाशते स्वयं स्वेन स्वं प्रति, न तु स्व-व्यतिरिक्तेण प्रमाणेन स्वव्यतिरिक्तं प्रमातारं प्रति,

"तदा परेण सह" इति असंबन्धात् = संबन्धाभावात्

संबन्धप्राणा — संबन्धमूला

कथं "परत्र" इति सप्तमी संगच्छताम् = 'पर' को जोड़ खाने से (संबन्धमूला होने से) सप्तमी विभक्तिः बनजी है ऐसा नही है—

परेत्र परत्रेति सप्तमी प्रयोगाविषयत्वेम स्वप्रकाशलक्षणम् इति वाक्यार्थः॥

(Left margin annotations:)

But will not the direct experience, being self manifest in itself, shine in something else? So although he knows the flower, although, but the process of knowing not having been the object of his perception, perception is not the searching twice — it was a year back when he [illegible]

If it be so, there being no connection with any [illegible] in so far as it does not in any other, how can the use of locative which depends on the relation (container & contained) be justified then in regard to it?

(5) he calls the residual trace of the flower to recollection — the memory of the flower comes quite like that but the process of understanding does not take [illegible] this time. That is

what the author means by saying तत्तुल्यं न तस्मात्; when we recall the memory of a taste we'll recall the taste but do not have the perception of a taste. we recall the taste in our memory but the tongue does not feel.

(तुल्यं)

तथा च रूपज्ञानेन .... न वेद्यते = यथा रूपज्ञानेन रसज्ञानं न वेद्यते (conception of shape does not create conception of taste) तथा स्मृत्यापि पूर्वानुभवो न वेद्यते ॥

ननु यदि वेद्यते तर्हि किं भवत् इति आह "एवहि" इति

फलतः, न तु साक्षात्, रूप रूपज्ञानेन रसज्ञाने गृहीते तत् विषयस्य रसास्यापि रूपग्राहकनेत्रविषये ग्रहणमथीयातमेव स्याद् इति भावः। Of course there is no cognition of colour from the residual trace of taste.

इत्थं प्रसंगः = रूपज्ञानेन रूपासन्नरूपा रसस्य विषयज्ञानापत्तिः।

तस्मात् ...

∴ How can this objection stand therefore the residual trace कि संस्कार से itself with स्मृत्य बनती है॥

भवता = उत्तरपक्षवादिना त्वया, सम्भाविता यो दोषः = स्मृत्यसंभवाख्यः

तस्य भंगाय = नाशाय (remove the objection raised by you). प्रभवत् = समर्थो भवत ॥

• कुत इति अपेक्षा - उत्तरमाह = "नैतत्" इति

यतो हि = यतः कारणात् आमआह।

असौ = सः स्मृत्य बोधः

*तत्संस्कारेण = आद्यसंस्कारेण

Because remembrance (knowledge) has arisen from a later cognition (cognition of a similar object).

*₁ संस्कृतात् = स्मृत्युत्पादने — एतेन "संस्कारजत्वे".

*₂ समनन्तर प्रत्ययात् = संस्कारोद्बोधक सदृशज्ञानात्

तत्सदृशः = पूर्वानुभवसदृशः only knowledge of similarity

* ——— = पहिले पूर्व अनुभव के संस्कार से

*₁ = संस्कृतात् = उत्पादनेन — इतना ही मतलब है "संस्कारजत्वे"

*₂ = फिर जब जो ज्ञान आती है — से वह केवल "सदृशता" ज्ञान (वस्तु) की है — पूर्वानुभव की

शाखासंनिवेश = जैसे मुड़ीमुड़ी की हुई शाखाओं का ठहराव इव

पूर्वसंनिवेशतुल्यः = जैसे पहिले शाखाओं का ठहराव था — यानी सीधी थी — वैसी

ननु ...... भवति = ऐसी बात नहीं कि पूर्व अनुभव के तुल्य बनके जिस से यह भी (स्मृत्य ज्ञान) भी अनुभव का या अर्थ का वेदक बने — वह स्वभाव केवल अनुभव ज्ञान का ही है — अनुभव ज्ञान ने अर्थ साक्षात् से देखा था — स्मृत्य ज्ञान में अभी केवल सादृश्य (image ही है) ॥

(In the left margin:) Out of the memory is as good as the taste (only mentally) not the actual tasting. ... ग्रहण ...

But it is right to suppose that whatever is produced by residual (of former experience) that is essentially the producer, a manifestor of that experience.

सदृशत्वस्य = Similarity को

गतिरवगमः कथं = संस्कार से उपजी हुवा स्मृत्य बोधः (सादृश्य रूप से) ऐसी ज्ञान भी कैसे बनेगी

Moreover how can there be Consciousness of Similarity? for neither direct experience nor remembrance produces consciousness of Similarity.

न हि अनुभव ज्ञाने सादृश्यं गमयति = नही पूर्व अनुभव ज्ञान ही को इस "सादृश्य" की ज्ञान हो सकती है।

ना तस्य पूर्व अनुभवज्ञानस्य –

गति = वेदनम्।

नापि स्मृति ज्ञानम् = नाही स्मृति ज्ञान में यह सादृश्य वेदन की शक्ति है।

परस्परम् असंवेदने = एक दूसरे के न जानने से

द्वयनिष्ठ सादृश्य = दो का मेल होकर "सादृश्य" Picture बनने पर

दो जगह में रहने वाली Similarity ठहर कर

अध्यवसाय-अयोगात् = इस का निश्चय कोई तीसरा ही कर सकता है – ~~इसलिए~~ क्योंकि स्मृतिः अनुभव का संवेदन नही कर सकती –

इस Similarity को determine करने वाला

~~इसलिए~~ – अन्यस्य ... अभावात् = क्योंकि तीसरा कोई जो इस 'सादृश्य' का समवेदन करता उस का अभाव होने से (तुम्हारे मत से)

इति = अतः कारणात्

Thus residual trace can make only objective reference possible in remembrance, but it cannot make the direct experience an object of experience, nor can it arouse the Consciousness that the object of remembrance is the object of former experience. This is undesirable.

संस्कारात् = संस्कार से, परम् = केवलम्

सविषयमात्रं = पूर्वानुभव विषयेण विषय सहितता मात्रम्

न तु अनुभवविषयत्वं = न कि अनुभव का संवेदन कर सकती है –

नापि अस्य विषयस्य = स्मृति विषयस्य।

पूर्वानुभव विषयीकृतत्वम् = अथानुभवन में विषय (object) को विषय करने का कर्तृत्व था – उस object को साक्षात् से देखा था, स्मृतिः में तो केवल "सादृश्य" Picture ~~जिस~~ का

Taste can be remembered not experienced at a later time.

Note II IPV :-

इह च पूर्वज्ञाने स्थितमभूत, तद्वद्यं संस्कार सादृश्याभ्यां भाव्य इति कल्प्यते, न तु सादृश्यं ज्ञातुं शक्यं, द्वयवेदी कि हि कृपि क्रमेणैव संनिवेशाद्वय गोगवययोरिव क्वचित् क्रमेण भूर्जे इव परापररूपे पश्यन् तृतीयः तत्सादृश्यमेवेयात् । न तु इह तृतीयोऽस्ति । स्थिरमात्मानमभ्युपयतापि वैशेषिकेण दुःसमर्थमेकविषयत्वे । स्मृत्यनुभवयोर्हि न ग्राहकं तृतीयं ज्ञानमस्ति, यत् तयोः सादृश्यमवगच्छेत् एकविषयतामध्यवस्येदुपचरेद्वा ॥

इति निश्चय एषः = This is undeniable.

(8) In recollection 2 tastes of a good well cooked basmati rice and a badly cooked low quality rice the memory (residual trace can (mentaly) recall the 2 tastes but physically neither of the 2 tastes will be percieved. This is what is meant = by "तत्तुल्यत्वं" नं तदगतिः" & "एक स्वाभासमेव

(9) understanding perception is only self contained. the residual trace "संस्कार" is there by itself in itself but it cannot create any new trace.

(10) If it is a trace of sight it cannot become a trace of taste it is self contained only. So the memory created by the residual trace of a previous perception comes up only as a memory and not as a perception

(11) This is a certainty

But your objection will stand only if direct experience be admitted really to shine in remembrance & through it its object also. The fact, however, is that remembrance being of the nature of determinate knowledge, seems to grasp the experience with object, though in reality they do not shine. This, therefore, is the nature of an illusion. Your objection therefore cannot stand.

यदि स्मृतिज्ञाने ...... स्यात् = जब स्मृतिः ज्ञान में परमार्थी से अनुभव का ही प्रकाश है ॥ ‡direct experience will be admitted to shine in remembrance & through it the object also

तन्मुखेन = और अनुभव द्वारा ही, तद्विषयस्य = आद्यानुभवविषयस्य

तदा भवेदुक्तेरवकाशः = तब ही आप की बात सही है – your objection will stand only when if ..... ‡

लेकिन — यावता = जब तक

स्मृतिर्विकल्परूपत्वात् = जब तक स्मृतिः विकल्प अवस्था में ही ठहरे

केवलम् = परं के अप्रकाशमानमेव = स्मृतिः अनुभव द्वारा तब तक अप्रकाशमान् है ॥

तद्विषयं च = पूर्वअनुभव विषय का भी तब तक उल्लेख मात्र ही है ।

तत् = ततः कारणात्, इयं = यह स्मृत्यः केवल भ्रान्ति रूप ही ठहरी ॥

तत्र कोऽयं निर्बन्धः = संबन्धः, insisting upon

The Saugata now urges the following view against the objection of the Shaiva-Atmavadin.

अथातद्विषयत्वेऽपि स्मृतेस्तदवसायतः ।
दृष्टालम्बनता भ्रान्त्या तदेतदसमञ्जसम् ॥ ३ ॥

योजना :- अथ स्मृतेः अतद्-विषयत्वे (पूर्वानुभव-तद्विषय असत्त्वे, अथवा पूर्वानुभव तद्विषयानवगमत्वे, अथवा न तावनुभवतद्विषयौ विषयो यस्याः स्मृतेः) अपि, तद् (पूर्वानुभव तद्विषयस्य च) अवसायतः (अध्यवसायतः, अर्थात् निश्चयात्) स्मृतेः दृष्टालम्बनता (अनुभवाश्रयत्वम्, अर्थात् दृष्टविषया) भ्रान्त्या, तत् एतद् असमञ्जसम (युक्तियुक्त न भवति) ॥

Eng: The Saugata Says :- Although remembrance does not have the former perception or its object as its object, (अतत्-विषयत्वेऽपि) yet, since Smṛti has the knowledge of both, the perception + its object (तदध्यवसायात:), it must therefore be admitted to be resting upon their illusively (दृष्टालम्बनता भ्रान्त्या) (Saugata thinks, it is because remembrance being a form (process) of determinate knowledge (विकल्परूपा), cognises the invisible past perception and its object, and therefore it must of illusive nature. Since there is neither the former perception nor its object as the object of remembrance, yet, there being the consciousness of both, this must be due to Smṛti being illusive in nature).

तद्दर्शनं = पूर्वानुभव: , स स्मृतेर्विषयो न भवति

तद्विषयोऽपि = पूर्वमनुभवविषयोऽपि स्मृतेर्विषयो न भवति,

यद्येवं तर्हि स्मृति: कथं तत्र व्यापारं करोति – इति आह

अध्यवसीयते = अध्यवसायविषयतां नीयते, स्मृत्येति शेष:

असमञ्जसम् = अयुक्तम् , न स्पष्ट: incongruous.

- Though neither the former direct experience nor its object is the object of remembrance, yet there is the determinate consciousness of both, because remembrance is erroneous in its nature

The Boudha says remembrance being simply consciousness of the past experience and the experienced object without the actual existance of either. So it the remembrance is only a Mayic deception. The Shawatine Vadin replies if your theory of deception is admitted, the whole

world will end in incongruous turmoil and everything, all knowledge will be reduced to disorder & confusion. All present and future Pravṛtti प्रवृत्ति planning depends on the remembrance of the past experience.

(3)

This Karika is an explanation of the assertion made by the Atma Vatin in the last Karika in the last words.

The Śaivātama-vadin refutes the Saugata's view. (Says) This view is quite incongruous (असमञ्जसम्).

This lacks consistency (or is strange)

The Saivatama-vadin Contradicts the Saugata's view :-

स्मृतितैव ^(1)^ कथं तावद् भ्रान्तेश्‍चार्थस्थिति ^(2)^ कथं।
^(3)^ पूर्वानुभवसंस्कारापेक्षा च किमितीष्यते ॥४॥

योजना :- (स्मृतिः) भ्रान्तेः ^(1)^ तावत, स्मृतितैव कथम्? ^(2)^ अर्थस्थिति च कथम्? ^(3)^ पूर्वानुभवसंस्कारापेक्षा च किम् इति इष्यते?

^(1)^ If it is thought to be an illusion (भ्रान्तेः) how can it have the essential nature of remembrance (स्मृतितैव कथं)? ^(2)^ How can the order of real objects be established on the basis of illusion? ^(3)^ Moreover, why should it be supposed to depend upon Sanskara left by former perception. (पूर्वानुभवसंस्कारापेक्षा च किमितीष्यते)?

'Confusion' Ab leads 3 questions in reference of the assertion of Confusion (1) How is remembrance possible on illusion, if it is one only illusion it could not be useful in life. The man may create a desire and works ... it is [illegible] a reality. An illusion ...

* अप्रमोषो = न पूरी तरह मिटा हुवा — अनपहारः = न पूरी तरह नष्ट हुवा

(2) The essential nature of remembrance is the shining of the object exactly in the manner as it shone in direct experience

अनुभूतस्य विषयस्य = जो अनुभव (प्रत्यक्षसे) अर्थ प्रकाशित हुवा हो पहिले

तथैव प्रकाशनम् = पूर्वानुभवानुगुण्येन स्फुरणम्

आत्मीयं रूपम् = निजं स्वरूपम् (स्मृत्येः का)

*· अनुभूतस्य विषयस्य असंप्रमोषः → कंचित् काले मध्ये मुषितस्येव न पूर्णः प्रमोषो-ऽपहारः पुनः प्रकाशनेन लाभादिति स्मृतेः मुख्यं रूपे → इह पूर्वानुभवो न प्रकाशते

(3)

...a sea-shell is not useful knowledge as it is illusory. But memory is the most useful thing in life but it is not illusory.

229

But if does not shine in the same, distinctive feature of remembrance is lost. — तत् = आत्मीय रूपम् , तथा प्रकाशनेनाभावे = प्रमोषरूपे
अतिशयेन — इदमिति स्फुरणे सति
विघटेततमाम् = नष्ट होजाती है पूरी तरह,
भ्रान्तौ = भ्रमे
In error it is either not existing according to Asat-vadins — असद् = असत्ख्यातिवादि पक्षे,
प्रख्याति = प्रसिद्ध — आत्मैव प्रख्याति
or it is Vasana that shines according to Atma-vadin (in error). — असद् = असद्वादी-
आत्माकारो = आत्मवादी
न तु तया = स्मृत्या — अर्थः = बाह्यार्थः
The error-type remembrance does not grasp any object in such a state. — स्वीक्रियते = गृह्यते , तस्य = अर्थस्य
अप्रकाशनात् = अस्फूर्तेः , इति = अतः कारणात्
तया = स्मृत्या , न व्यवस्थापितः स्थितियुक्तो न कृतः
व्यवस्थापना = अर्थस्थिति . — The object does not shine in it.

(for future action of the delivery of the necessary silver)

(1) Thus, the object is not made manifest by error so as to become an object of action in practical life. — ततश्च = भ्रान्तिरूपात् स्मरणाच्च .
अभिलापपूर्वेण व्यवहारः = अभिलापपूर्वको व्यवहारः
तदप्रकाशने = अर्थाग्रहणे, कथं स्यात्
कथं न कृत्यमित्यत आह "तत" इति
तत् = संस्कारजत्वम् , सादृश्यम् = पूर्वानुभवसादृश्यत्वम्
न च = जब भ्रान्ति रूप स्मृति हो
स्मृत्यभिधानाया भ्रान्तेः = सु स्मृति जो भ्रान्तिरूप है
अनुभवेन प्रकाशनात्मना = अनुभव से ~~जो~~ में जो विषय प्रकाशित है
उस के साथ इस भ्रान्ति भ्रान्तिरूप की स्मृति है कोई similarity
सर्वथा विषयमस्पृशन्त्या = भ्रान्तित्वांगीकारे नहीं है.
लोकमपि विषयस्य स्पर्शम प्राप्तवत्या

(Left margin: Consider the usefulness in life but memory is the most useful thing. (3) Whatever is a result of the traces of earlier experience, why bring the traces into being? The remembrance is the direct result of earlier experience and ... called ...)

(2) तद्विषयोऽपि नैव प्रकाशते अपि तु सम्यक् प्रकर्षेण मुदित इवासौ जातः ॥

But if it be said that there is similarity of remembrance with direct experience, in as much as both, the experience and its object, are determinately apprehended by it and, therefore,

in order to explain this partial similarity, the assumption of residual trace is necessary. Well, what do you mean by "determinately apprehended"? If you mean "manifested" then it (remembrance) ceases to be of erroneous nature; but if thereby is meant "not manifested", then again the object not having been made manifest, the use of word "similarity" is meaningless in this connection.

अनुभवे: = पूर्वकालीन इति भाव:, तद्विषया = अनुभवविषया

तया = भ्रान्तित्वेन कल्पमानया स्मृत्या, अध्य

अध्यवसीयते = उल्लिख्यते, ततः = अध्यवसायाद्धेतोः

तत्सिद्धये = सादृश्यसिद्धये

"अध्यवसीयते" इत्यस्य कोऽर्थः?

अनया = स्मृत्या,

एतत्कारणात् सादृश्यमिति शब्दगडुमात्रम् = व्यर्थमेवेति भाव:

व्यवहारानर्हत्वात्, उभयोर्मध्ये एकस्य जडत्वात्,
अर्थे भ्रान्तित्व कल्पित स्मृत्यवसायात् ॥

As to the point said by the Saugata that there is similarity between remembrance & the former perception, since both, the former perception & its object are determinately cognised by remembrance, & this similarity is due to Saṁskāra, the Shaiva-atmavadin states that the use of the word "similarity" in this connection has no significance. He therefore, argues :-

भ्रान्तित्वे चावसायस्य न जडाद्विषयस्थितिः।
ततोऽजाड्ये निजोल्लेख-निष्ठान्नार्थस्थितिस्ततः
॥५॥

योजना :- (स्मृतिः) अवसायस्य भ्रान्तित्वे च (अत एव जडस्वभावत्वे), जडाद् विषयस्थितिः न (भवति), ततः (तद्)

If remembrance is illusive it is lifeless jaḍa and cannot illumine worldly actions

... in practice really does. But if now we take it to be lifeful. It has

अजाड्ये निज-उल्लेखनिष्ठात्, ततः (स्मृत्यध्यवसायात्)
अर्थस्थिति न (विषयस्य व्यवस्थापनं न भवति) ॥

If the knowledge of remembrance be supposed to be illusive in its nature, therefore lacking sentiency or self luminosity (भ्रान्तित्वावसाया च) it cannot manifest (establish) the real objects (अजात् विषयास्थिति न). Even though it be accepted to be self-luminous, sentient (अजडा) yet its self luminosity is confined to itself (निज उल्लेखनिष्ठात्) it can not establish the order of external objects.

But the quality of being self contained only as even then it cannot ... as object of ...

Remembrance स्मृतेः = स्मृतित्वेन कल्प्यमानस्य, or अन्यस्य वा = स्मृतित्वेन अकल्प्यमानस्य वा।

or any erroneous knowledge भ्रान्तिबोधस्य = भ्रमज्ञानस्य -

in its self-luminous aspect of illumining itself, is not erroneous स्वसंवेदनांशे = बोधत्वेनापरिहार्ये स्वप्रकाश भागे, कीदृशे?
प्रकाशमाने = स्वं प्रति स्वयं स्फुरणशीले,
न भ्रान्तिता = भ्रान्तिभावो न भवति, अत्र हेतुमाह 'तत्र' इति

* because it not contradicted. तत्र = स्वसंवेदनांशे, विषय ग्रहणरूपत्वस्य
* तत्र वैपरीत्याभावात् = तत्र न भ्रान्तित्वम् - is not contradicted

Erroneousness is confined to what is pictured up
यस्तु तत्र = भ्रान्तौ
अध्यवसीयते = उल्लिख्यते , स्वाकारः = ज्ञानाकारः

For though the pictured up is nothing but a form of self itself, yet it is not apprehended as such, on the other hand it is apprehended as an object.
स = स्वाकारः , अस्वाकारत्वेन = यतोऽसावस्याः स्वाकारो न भवति ततो हेतोः,
विपरीततया = वैपरीत्येन, अध्यवसीयते न हि सा प्रमा अपितु भ्रान्तिरेव।
अर्थतया = अर्थभावेन स्थितत्वादिति भावः, अध्यवसाय-
काले ज्ञानमर्थरूपमेव संपद्यते अन्यथा ग्रहणासंभवात् ॥

Your theory is obviously wrong.

Hence Remembrance is an error in respect of its object.

तत्रांशे = अध्यवसायमाने स्वाकारांशे, भ्रान्तिता भवति न प्रमात्वम् ॥

And because Remembrance or any other type of error has no true reference to the external object & does not say anything about it.

सत्यांशे = अध्यवसीयमानः स्वाकारांशश्च कीदृशः?

अर्थलक्षणः = अर्थस्वरूपतां प्राप्तः

स्मृत्या = स्मृतिभावेन कल्प्यमानया

अन्यया वा भ्रान्त्या न स्पृश्यते = तत्सदृशस्य अन्यस्य कस्यापि कल्पनात् पुरःस्थोऽपि ग्रहणविषयतां न नीयते।

तत्र अंशे जडत्वम्.....

it is therefore not luminous in relation to that object.

इति = अतः कारणात्, तत्र = तस्मिन्नंशे

असौ = स्मृतिरूपा अन्या वा भ्रान्तिः

Just as knowledge of jar is not related to knowledge of jar.

* तूष्णीका = मौनदशामापन्नैव भवति, इति=अतः कारणात्

जडत्वम् अस्याः = स्मृतिरूपाया अन्याया वा भ्रान्तेः

विलुप्येत = नश्येदित्यर्थः ॥

अथ तु = If, however.

'तु' = शब्दः पक्षान्तरद्योतकः तम् = समनन्तरोक्तम्

*

* On the basis of the self-luminous aspect, & still because remembrance in its self-luminosity is confined to itself, & what is pictured up there, and because it cannot refer to external object even in name, how can it explain the determinate manifestation of and the practical attitude towards the object (which is based upon it).

निजं = स्वसंवेदनरूपभूतम्, उल्लेखश्च स्वाकारः = अवसायरूपः स्वाकारः

इतीयति = निजभूते स्वसंवेदने उल्लेखरूपे स्वाकारे च,

* व्यवस्थापनम् = व्यवस्थायाः करणम्, कीदृशम्?

परिनिष्ठता = अवसानं गता,

स्मृतिः — भ्रान्तिरूप, ततः = तस्मात्

स्मृत्यध्यवसायात् = भ्रान्तित्वेन कल्पितात् स्मृतिरूपादध्यवसायात् *

Kastri : Page 101

Remembrance or any other erroneous knowledge, is not erroneous in its Self-luminous aspect of illuminating itself, because it is never contradicted. Erroneousness is confined to what is pictured up there. For, though the pictured up is nothing but a form of Self itself, yet it is not apprehended as such: on the contrary it is apprehended as object. Hence remembrance is an error in respect of its object. And because remembrance or any other type of error has no true reference to external object

P. 100

and does not say anything about it, it is therefore not luminous in relation to that object, just as knowledge of jar is not in relation to cloth. And because that, which is not Self-luminous, has nothing to do with external object, therefore practical life, related to external object (which is based on remembrance) would disappear.

If, however, on the basis of Self-luminous aspect, or its determinate form, it be said to be Self-luminous, still because remembrance in its Self-luminosity is confined to itself and what is pictured up there, and because it cannot refer to external object even in name, how can it explain the determinate manifestation of and the practical attitude towards the object (which is based upon it)

Point of View in the next Karikas

2 The Saugata might think, that part of Remembrance which refers to ~~in~~ the indeterminate Cognition (Consciousness) of itself is not illusive in nature, on the other hand, that part of it which refers to determinate Cognition of object in contradiction to indeterminate Cognition of itself, involves illusiveness.

2. Hence Remembrance is an error & so non-luminous (Jāḍa) in relation to its object. [1] In the assertion of Saugata that remembrance is due to residual trace sanskara, there can be 2 alternatives both of which do not stand to argument.

No 1. It is delusion. Delusion is jada-lifeless, it being without self Prakasha cannot light up the old object. So it won't be useful in life. But remembrance is the basis of all life so it cannot be a delusion. [illegible] as Vedantins etc say.

No 2. If it be said it is not lifeless it is helpful but dependent on residual trace only - but the residual trace being only self-manifest it cannot have any relation with other cognitions - In active life all cognitions are correlated and inter connected which can take place only if the

governing ruler of all cognitions, observation, remembrance storing up in chidakasha, recollection at the proper time etc is one fixed personality. Thus he refutes the Saugata theory and established the

न घटते = न युज्यते, उक्तन्यायादिति भावः,

परस्पर संगतिहीनानि = परस्परमसंबन्धानि, स्मृतेरेव संबन्धहेतुत्वादिति भावः

The Saivātma-vadin arrives now at his own point of view & from the above discussion, it is evident that even though we may agree with the Saugata that there remains the Sanskāra of the former perception, yet remembrance cannot originate from it, for then all the kinds of cognitions (ज्ञानानि) will be dissociated from one another. The established order of the world depends upon the unification of cognitions of all kinds, which figure in remembrance in association with one another. So remembrance is indispensable to practical life. Even the direct perception of "Self" is impossible without remembrance of one's conventional self which depends upon the unification of the consciousness of the former and the later states of consciousness. If we are to believe as Saugata states that all cognitions are self-luminous but they mutually differ and do not know one another, then they will be like dumb & deaf and hence insentient in relation to one another. So the teacher states his point of view in the following two concluding verses of this Ahnika:-

Thus, even though there be residual trace, yet the [illegible] in no way possible. And, therefore, all dealings will be withered [illegible] tual connection. This is what has been said in the preceding [illegible] verses. The author now connects it with the point under discussion.

एवमन्योन्यभिन्नानाम परस्परवेदिनाम् ।
ज्ञानानामनुसंधान जन्मा नश्येज्जनस्थितिः ॥ ६ ॥

योजना:- एवम् अन्योन्यभिन्नानाम् अपरस्परवेदिनाम् ज्ञानानाम् अनुसंधान-जन्मा जनस्थितिः नश्येत ॥

The teacher says:- All human transactions originate from the unification of cognitions (like perception, remembrance, although they mutually differ and cannot know one another (अपरस्परवेदिनाम्) But if a central unification power is absent, all these human transactions will come to an end.

या काचन = काचन आन्तर बाह्यरूपा,

अनुसन्धानस्य स्वरूपमाह :-

एकविषयभावेन = पूर्वानुभावेन सह एकविषयतया उपपन्ना या सा स्मृतिता स्मृतिभावः तस्या प्राप्तिः सारूपं यस्य तादृशस्य,

तत्र = उक्तरूपे अनुसंधाने

प्रायत्ना = वद्धा, तत उत्पन्नेति यावत्,

स्मरणनिबन्धना: .... = अभिलाषोत्पादनद्वारेण स्मृतिकार्याः ॥

प्रथमम् = सर्वप्रमाणमूलभूतत्वेन तेषाम् आद्यभूतम्,

"अहमिति" → अहं पश्यामीत्यादौ स्थितो योऽहम्परामर्शः, तद्रूपं यत् पूर्वापरानुसंधानं तेन

स्मरणानुप्राणितेन = पूर्वकालविशेषतात्मरूपविषयानुभवेन सह एकविषयापरकालविशेषितस्वात्मरूपविषयस्मृतिजन्मसत्ताकेन, तद्रूपेण विना

विना = अन्तरेण,

(1) So the conclusion arises that remembrance being the base of all worldly transactions of Buddhist view is accepted the past experiences cannot unite nor can they know each other. The

Karika (6)

page. 103.

practical life of humanity depends upon unification of cognitions of all types, i.e., upon their (cognitions) figuring in remembrance as related to the same objects as those to which they were originally. It is as follows:-

All transactions depend upon remembrance. For instance, the very first (the most important kind of cognition) the direct perception (प्रत्यक्ष ज्ञान:) is not possible without the conscious unification of the former and the latter states of self. And this is made possible by remembrance alone. For, if the object of direct perception be not related to the subject, direct perception would cease to be so. Similar would be the case, (it has to be admitted) with pleasure etc also. And, rejecting, accepting, actuating, praising or admitting and other similar transactions (are all due to remembrance & therefore) are based upon remembrance. Thus, all human transactions which are due to unification of cognitions with one another, would come to naught, if the view of the opponent be accepted. But if some one were to ask: "How"? The author replies by means of adjuncts. The cognitions are different from one another. The indeterminate knowledge is different from the determinate knowledge, limited by present time, and that also is different

P.T.O.

from remembrance. Therefore, these cognitions make their objects alone manifest, and, in respect of the objects of other cognitions are like eisentient dumb and deaf or both and cannot make them manifest. (6).

Thus, there cannot be determinate unification either of cognitions as such or their objects. Nor can one cognition shine as an object of another. Nor is there any fourth cause of relation of cognitions, which may bring their unification. Therefore all transactions would come to naught. And these transactions cannot be destroyed simply because of desired curse. "Let them be destroyed." But because they have existence, therefore, it is necessary that an effort should be made to explain this.

But even the creator cannot do this unless the method accepted by us, be followed. This the author clarifies as follows. (6).

and also indirectly in the opening verse of this book. ...

न घटते = न युज्यते ; कुतः ?

प्रमातरि विश्रान्त्यभावात् = प्रमाता में जब विश्रान्ति न हो

अप्रत्यक्षत्व प्रसङ्गात् = तो ज्ञान "अहं पश्यामि" प्रत्यक्ष नहीं होगा ॥

स चायमनुसन्धैकरसतया प्रमाता व्यवहारस्तदभावे मूर्छित प्रायी भवेदिति भावः ॥

"अहं पश्यामि" इति नेत्रद्वारेण "अहम्" शब्दवाच्ये प्रमातरि विश्रान्तं दर्शनं "प्रत्यक्षम्" इति वक्तुं योग्यम् ॥

मन्तव्यम् = ज्ञातव्यम् ।

स्मरणमया एव = स्मृतिहेतुकत्वेन तद्रूपा एव, न हि विस्मृते उपादानादि दृष्टमिति भावः ॥

अनुसंधानम् = विषयद्वारेण मेलनम् ।

पराभ्युपगमे = बौद्धमताश्रयणे, न घटेत = नाशं गच्छेत

कोऽसौ हेतुरित्यपेक्षायामाह "अन्योन्यम्" इति

भिन्नमेव दर्शयति "अन्यत" इति ।

भिन्नानि ज्ञानानि = एक प्रमातृविश्रान्तिं विना इति भावः

अनुभव ज्ञानं = शुद्ध ज्ञानमित्यर्थः

इदानीन्तनं ज्ञानं = सविकल्प ज्ञानम्

अन्यत् स्मरण संमतं ज्ञानम् = स्मृतिः ज्ञान से भी जो है — शुद्ध अनुभव ज्ञान

सविकल्पनात् = ततः कारणात्

एतानि = यह सारे ज्ञान, स्वविषय प्रकाशमात्ररूपाणि = यह सारे ज्ञान अपने अपने ही विषय पर ठहरते हुए

अविकल्प, सविकल्प ज्ञान, स्मरण रूपाणि

परविषय = एक ज्ञान दूसरे ज्ञान के विषय पर.

आद्यात (1) and also stated in the Kārikā No. 1 Āhnika 1 | (2) of new worldly actions which will reach destruction of the Buddhist theory is accepted, So the only solution left is shown as Ātmavāda theory which ... ... under

स्वरूपतः = स्वरूपेण
वेद्यतः = वेद्यद्वारेण
तुर्यम् = स्वरूपेकी भाव - वेद्यैकीभाव - विषयविषयभावा-
एवंनयापेक्षया चतुर्थं किमपि

जडान्धमूकमूक कल्पानि = जड, अन्धे, मूंगे और बहरे ही रहेंगे - क्योंकि हर एक ज्ञान अलग अलग होने से और हर किसी ज्ञान का अलग अलग विशेषरूप विषय होनेसे

न च अन्योन्यस्य च प्रकाशरूपाणि = न एक दूसरे को प्रकाशित करने से -

एवं न .... अनुसंधानम् अस्ति =
स्मृतिर्न स्वरूपतोऽनुभवं विषयी करोति न वेद्यतो अनुभूतं विषयी करोति इति ॥

अन्योन्ये च ..... नास्ति = आपस वेद्यवेदक भाव नहीं है

न च तुर्यं = चौथा भी कोई ज्ञातयः बांधौ रूप

निबन्धनम् = संबन्धः, कारणम्

ज्ञानानां मेलकाद्रकर्म
अनुसन्धानाधायि = जो इन अनुभव, विकल्प, स्मरण इत्यादि ज्ञानों का अनुसंधान (एकी विषयभाव करने वाला बनता)

संभाव्यते = तुम्हारे मत से इसी को संभावना नहीं है

नाशंगच्छेत्
ध्वंसेरन् व्यवहाराः = इस कारण विश्व व्यवहार सारा नष्ट हो जायेगा,

ते = व्यवहाराः, कुतो न ध्वंसन्ते, इति आह
"प्रकाशन्ते यतः" इति - प्रकाशमानस्य ध्वंसो वक्तुमयुक्त एवेति भावः ।

एतत = वक्ष्यमाणं वस्तु, आपद्यते = बलादंगीकर्तव्यमित्यर्थः

उद्यन्तव्यम् = उद्योगः कार्यः, तत उद्योगमेव करिष्याम इत्यत आह "तत् च" । अस्माकमभिमतो यः प्रकारः - आत्मसमर्थनरूपः, तेन, विना, अप्यवक्यं समर्थनं यस्य तादृशम् ॥

This very Samvid[2], the Self-luminous principle, when made as if it were different from itself by what has merged (out of universal Samvid) is called ever renewing cognition, because of the reflection of the externally manifested external objects on it, due to its being extrovert. But still because these new cognitions rise and disappear, the same impossibility of transactions follows. Therefore (it is to be admitted that) the Self-luminous principle, which became extrovert at the time of grasping an external object, has its introvert (Antarmukha) Self-luminosity intact even at a subsequent time. And this (introvert Self-luminosity) becomes aware of its having become extrovert in relation to a particular object, and therefore is called the power of remembrance. And that which directly cognises or remembers a new object is identical with universal Self-luminous principle. Hence the universal is ever perfect and in reality there is nothing new, directly cognised or remembered.

And then, as a matter of course this also has to be admitted that whatever is made manifest, is separate from Samvid, so is one Samvid from another; and that this (Separation) power, is not really possible. Hence it is called

see page 3

karika - 7 :-

of course nobody denies that Self (Samvid) Shines. But if that Self be self-confined (be resting within itself) how can it make the objects the objects shine (manifest)? But if objects also be admitted to be essentially self-shining, then they also being self-confined, the distinction between the perceiver and the perceived will be lost. Therefore, the Budhist also, desiring to represent Samvid (विज्ञान:) to be the illuminator of the object, has to admit that the object ~~is~~ also is included within the Samvid itself. But if the manifester of the object be changing every moment (as the Budhist holds) the remembrance will not be possible. Therefore Samvid is only one and as such it includes the whole objective world within it self. This also he has to admit much against his will. Still this Samvid, because it contains the whole universe within itself therefore, will shine with whole universe either manifest or otherwise, because such is its nature. But it is not so. Therefore it follows that Samvid makes some objects manifest as separate from itself out of the mass of objects, which lie ~~in~~ merged in it, as identical with it. This is called power of knowledge.

P.T.O.

Karika (7) Contd.
from page 2:-

mere appearance, because all that is created is mere appearance (Abhāsā). And the separation (differentiation) is so called because it cuts the differentiated off on all sides (from the rest). That power, therefore, which is responsible for manifestation of one thing as distinct from the rest, is called the power of differentiation (अपोहन शक्तिः).

All the worldly transactions depend upon this triad of powers. It is due to the triad of powers of that Glorious One that there is the manifestation of limited perceivers, Chaitra & Maitra etc, who are naturally limited in their direct experience, remembrance & definite knowledge. It is He, who directly experiences, remembers and determinately cognises through the various limited subjects:—

"Although practical approach to the objective world (apparently) depends on the individual subject, limited by vital airs & the constituents of subtle body, yet it depends upon the universal Self."

And universal is the variety of ways in which these powers of knowledge etc are manifested.

Contd on page 4. P.T.O.

This capacity of manifestation is the power of freedom (स्वातन्त्र्या). This is called perfect and independent great power, when it is compared with the powers of Brahma, Vishnu & Rudra who are its creations. And this sentient in its nature "Chit Vapuh". Thus it follows He is Omnipotent. And because He is different from the insentient, characterised by being one of the fixed form, therefore, He is spoken of as Great Lord, characterised by the possession of powers of knowledge etc.

If this be not admitted, nothing will be manifest. This is the unwelcome consequence. But because the objects are manifest, therefore it has to be admitted. This is the opposite conclusion. "The practical life of humanity will come to an end if it be not so"; this is the connection of the present verse with the previous one. The word "तु" implies the opposite conclusion. (7)

न चेदन्तः कृतानन्त विश्वरूपो महेश्वरः।
स्यादेकश्चिद्वपुर्ज्ञान-स्मृत्यपोहन-
शक्तिमान् ॥६॥

योजनाः- अन्तःकृत-अनन्त विश्वरूपः चिद्वपुः ज्ञान-स्मृति-
अपोहन - शक्तिमान एकः महेश्वरः न चेत् स्यात् ॥

Eng: If we deny the existence of one great Lord, a permanent Subject, the Self of all (एकः महेश्वरः न चेद् स्याद्) who is essentially of sentient nature (चिद्वपुः) who holds within himself the whole form (manifestation) of this infinite universe (अन्तःकृत-अनन्त-विश्वरूपः) and who possesses the powers of cognition, remembrance and differentiation (ज्ञान-स्मृत्य-पोहन शक्तिमान,) all this human transaction will come to an end (जगत्स्थिति नश्येत्)

Of-course in body

सा = संवित्, स्वात्मविश्रान्तिमात्र = स्वयं प्रकाश निजस्वरूपमात्रपरा

कुतो न सा अर्थस्य प्रकाश इत्यत आह "स हि" - इति

हि = यस्मात् सः = अर्थस्य प्रकाशः,

अर्थधर्म एव स्यात् = न तु स्वतन्त्रसंवित् स्वरूपभूत इति भावः

तावत्येव = स्वात्म मात्रे एव, अर्थात्मन्येव

गलितः = नष्टः, अर्थ प्रकाशस्य स्वात्ममात्र निष्ठत्वेन प्रमातृस्पर्शासंभवादिति भावः,

ननु तर्हि ग्राह्यग्राहक भाव संबन्धः कथं सिद्ध्येदित्यत आह "अतः" इति, अतः कारणात्

संविदम् = स्वतन्त्रसंवित्त्वम्

इच्छता = बौद्धेनेति शेषः , बलादेव = मजबूर होकर

अर्थोऽपि = यह अर्थ भाव भी

तद्रूपान्तर्गत एव = स्वतन्त्र संविद्रूपान्तर्गत इत्यर्थः, न तु ततो बहिःस्थ, तत्वे हि अर्थधर्मत्वापातात् ग्राह्यग्राहक-भावासंभवापात इति भावः

ननु सोऽर्थप्रकाश एक एव उत उत्तरोत्तरं नव एव इत्यत आह "स च" इति

अन्यश्चान्यश्च = नवो नव इत्यर्थः वह संविद् रूप अर्थ प्रकाश जब वह ज्ञान क्षणिक है

नोपपन्नम् = अनुसन्धातुरसंभवादिति भावः,

असौ = अर्थ प्रकाशः

अङ्गीकार्यम् = अन्यथा वेद्य भेदेन तस्यापि भेदापातादिति भावः।

एवमपि = सर्ववेद्यराशि क्रोडीकारेऽपि

उन्मग्नेन = विषयाश्रयणात् लेशतः प्रादुर्भूतेन ,

निमग्नेन = साकल्येन तदनाश्रयणाद् बाहुल्येन अप्रकटेन

विश्वात्मना = सर्वात्मना

प्रकाशेत = नहि एकस्य वस्तुनो युगपत प्रकाश-अप्रकाशौ युक्ताविति भावः, अत्र हेतमाह- "तथा" इति

तथा स्वभावत्वात् = प्रकाशस्वभावत्वात्.

न चैवम् - दृश्यते इति शेषः, न तु इतत् अनुभूयते.
तर्हि किम् कार्यमित्य आह 'अतः' इति

अपरम् = तन्मध्ये विषयीकृते कमपि भावम्
भगवान् स्वस्वान्त्यात भावराशिमध्यात् कंचिद्भावं प्रकाश-स्वरूपात् पृथक् करोति - See Note 51 IPV. Page 108

भिन्नाकारम् = ज्ञेयतया स्थितत्वादिति भावः, कंचिदेवार्थम् = अपरम भिन्नाकारम्

स्वरूपात् = स्वान्तः कृतसर्ववेद्यराशेः निजरूपात्

This very Samvid, the self-luminous principle when made as if it were different by what has emerged out of universal Samvid is called ever renewing cognition because of its reflection of the externally manifested external objects on it, due to its being extrovert.

उन्मग्नाभासैः = विषयकरणेन प्रादुर्भावं नीतैः घटपटादिरूपैः आभासैः

भिन्नम् च = भिन्नमिव संपादितम् ।

बहिर्मुखत्वात् = इदमिति बहिर्मुखताऽऽश्रयणेन

तच्छायानुरागात् = उन्मग्नाभासच्छायोपरागात्

नवं नवं ज्ञानम् = प्रमाणरूपं नवीनं नवीनं ज्ञानम् — (बहिर्मुखस्वरूपम्).

उक्तम् & , दृश्यते चैकस्यैव जलस्य तरंगादिरूपैराभासैर्नवनवत्वम् इति न कोपि विरोधः

एवमपि = ज्ञानशक्ति समर्थेन

इति सैव ..... निवहहानिः = तेषां नवनवाभासानां प्रतिक्षणम् उदयलयग्रस्तत्वेन कथं व्यवहारोपयोग इत्यर्थः ॥

गृहीतपूर्वे = पूर्वम् अनुभवकाले गृहीते, संवेदनम् = अनुभवरूपम्

तस्य = पूर्वम् इदमिति बहिर्मुखीभूतस्य संवेदनस्य

अन्तर्मुखम = अहमिति स्थितम्, चित्स्वरूपत्वम् = सारतया स्थितः चित्स्वरूपभावः, कीदृशम् ?

कालान्तरेऽपि = स्मृतिकालेऽपि, अवस्थास्नु = नित्यतया तिष्ठत सत्,

स्वात्मगतम् = संस्कारभावेन स्वात्मनि स्थितम्,

तत् = पुरातनम्, विषयविशेषे = स्वान्तर्गतवेद्यराशिमध्यात् विषयतया गृहीते कुत्रापि वेद्ये

बहिर्मुखत्वम् = इदमिति ग्रहणरूपं बहिर्भावम् ।

परामृशति = स्वात्मगतां तामेव विशिष्टविषयां बहिर्मुखतां परामृशति ॥

वस्तुतः = परमार्थेन ,   विश्वमयषा = अन्तः कृत सर्व वेद्यरूपया
तादात्म्येन = तद्रूपतया ,   वृत्तिः = स्थिति यस्य तादृशम्
विश्वमयम् = संवित्स्वरूपम् ,   न स्यात् = अन्यथा
पूर्णत्वासंभवादिति भावः

प्रवाहपतितम् = अनिच्छया आगतम् , तत् कथमनुभवस्य
स्मृतेर्वा उत्थानं युक्तम्, तयोस्तद्विषयोद्व संविदि
निमग्नत्वादित्यत आह ' यत् किल " इति

ततः = तस्माद्विषयात्, संविद्य = तद्विषया संविद् च,

अभास्यते = आभासविषयतां नीयते , चिद्रूपेण कर्त्रा इति शेषः

संविदन्तरात् = सर्वागारकत्वेन स्थितायाः अन्यत्वेन भासमानायाः संविदः

संवेद्यम् = संविदो विषयोऽर्थः

संवेद्यान्तरात् = तस्मिन् काले विषयतामगतात् संवेद्यराशेः

ननु यद्येवं तर्हि विच्छेदनस्यापि सत्यतया स्थितत्वाद् अद्वैतहानिरि- त्यत आह-
"नच" इति । केवलमवभासनम् - अवभासमात्रम् ।

तत् = विच्छेदनम् ,   इयता = अवभासमात्रेन

पारमार्थिकम् = सत्यभूतम्

अयमेव = अवभास एव , सर्वत्र ज्ञेये कार्ये वा अवभासमात्र एव परमार्थः
तथा च न अद्वैतहानि,

यतः = पंडितैः ,   एक एव = विच्छेद एव

परितप्रच्छेदनात् = छेदस्य करणात्

तत् = तस्मात्कारणात् ,   अवभासने = प्रोक्तस्वरूपस्य- अवभासस्य करणे ,

सामर्थ्यम् = समर्थता -

अर्थस्थितिः = अर्थविषयो व्यवहारः ,   निरूढा = स्थितिं गता

सा = अर्थस्थितिः ,

वैचित्र्यविकल्पः = विचित्रतारूपम्,
ऐश्वर्यम् = ईश्वरता,
तत् = तस्मात्कारणात् - एवम् सति,
चिद्घपुरित्येवं कृत्वा = चिद्घपुरित्यनेन कारणे
विश्वरूपः = सर्वभाव स्वरूपो भवति,
तत एव च = विश्वरूपत्वाद् हेतोश्च , परिनिष्ठुतो = स्वरूप-
मात्रेऽवसाने गता,
अतएव एकरूप ये जडभावाः तेभ्यो
वैलक्षण्यात् —.

Note: See also pages 23, 24 Research Series
Free India Silver Jubilee
No IX.

Ahnika IV. (1)

Karika (1).

The point to be thought over is this i.e. is it that (in remembrance) the Self-luminous principle (संवेदनता), which is free from the limitation of time, and all the objects, which are within it, are experienced as Self-luminous? If so, there should be the experience of universal "I" as holding the entire objective world within itself. But if there be the experience of the objects as "this", and, therefore, as distinct from the Self-luminous principle, there are two alternatives :-

(1) If the objectivity (इदन्ता) rests on "I", then, it being the State, known as Sadā-Shiva, Consciousness would be "I am this"

(2) but if it does not rest on 'I', the Consciousness must be "this". And because there is the Consciousness of novelty, therefore, it be direct experience and not remembrance. With this objection in mind the Author says "free" "स्वतन्त्र". It means one whose nature it is to employ, without fail, his means for the accomplishment of the end; for he who employs himself in his work without requiring any other prompter, therefore, because of his freedom he has the Consciousness "that"

(2)

And the essential nature of this experience "that" is that it is not the experience of the pure Subject "I" which is entirely free from limitation of time, nor is it that of something which is altogether different from the Subject (i.e pure object), but that of the object, (i) which, formerly at the time of direct experience, was differentiated from the universal Self, because of its association with the individual Subject, limited by time and place of the former perception and therefore was not merged in "I", (ii) which in that very condition was separately placed, wrapped up in darkness as if it were, and (iii) which is referred to by the word "Residual trace", when, therefore, that cover of darkness is removed from the object, it shines as before, as differentiated from the Subject.

But why does it not then shine as "this" as it did before? It does not so shine, because it shines as associated with the body, time & place of the first perception, because of which it was differentiated from the universal Subject "Aham". And for this very reason it is that the consciousness of it shining at the present time of remembrance does not altogether disappear. There is, therefore

Ahnika IV. (1)

We bow to that Śiva, who strings in a regular order the multitude of gems, the objects, which he heaped up in the treasury of His heart, on the string of remembrance

Thus it has been shown that remembrance is preceded by direct perception and that both of them depend upon the power of differentiation. This has been pointed out to be the only possible way of accounting for the the facts of experience. Now, according to the introductory statement, remembrance has to be dealt with in order to support the the opposite conclusion, which follows from the unwelcome consequence (of the Critic's position). For, the introductory statement (in the last chapter) was "True, but the cognition, called remembrance".

There may not be the possibility of the rise of remembrance from residual trace, but it has to be explained how with the power of the Lord, as admitted by you, make it possible? In order to answer this objection the following 8 verses beginning with "Because that experiencer of the former object" and ending in "The object shine in the experiencer" are given.

It is asserted in the 1st verse that remembrance is possible on the opponent's assumption. The second

now stated that remembrance has the power to illumine the particular object of the former direct experience. In the third it is stated that remembrance enters into the direct experience and its object so as to become one with them. The 4th shows how remembrance does not illumine the former direct experience as an object. The 5th corroborates the statement made in the 4th, by asserting that in the experience of the other's experience by a yogin, the other's experience does not figure separately as an object. In the 6th the counter assertion, that remembrance does have the direct experience as its separate object, is shown to be based on an imaginary analysis and, therefore, baseless. In the 7th it is shown by the way that in the determinate cognition there is even in the unification with the former direct experience. In the 8th it is asserted that remembrance, its object and its subject rest on the one sentient principle and so, by the way, do perception, its object & subject. This is the summary. Now the verses begin will be explained in due order.

Consciousness of the time of the past direct (3) experience, 'associated' with the present time of remembrance. The latter predominates.

Thus it is said that the experience "that" is the embodiment of two contrary experiences of the former and the latter times. And thus, that highest Lord alone remembers. His remembrance is nothing else than His assuming the form of limited subject, such as is fit to be affected by time & Kalā etc. and is necessary for the consciousness of this kind. Thus remembrance is unity in multiplicity, because it is due to Māyā & Vidyā. And therefore, it is that those, who are well versed in the Agamās, hold that remembrance when animated by Mantra etc is like Chintāmani, capable of giving all Sidhis, as follows:—

Remembrance itself, assuming the form of contemplation, exposes your glory as Chintāmani does the wealth." This will do.

The compound ending in ——— .

(1) ...... We shall explain that such a compound conveys the idea of unity in multiplicity (1).

चतुर्थमाह्निकम्

पदार्थरत्ननिकरं निजहृद्गञ्जपुञ्जितम् ।
ग्रथ्नन्तं स्मृतिसूत्रान्तः संतत्यैव स्तुमः शिवम् ॥

निकरं = खजाना, संग्रह, चट्टा, समुच्चय,
गञ्जः = खजाना, पुंजित = एक जगह लगाया हुवा ढेर, दबाया हुवा.

निजहृद्गंज पुञ्जितम् = निजहृदयाख्यकोश पुञ्जीभूतं सन्तम् ॥

पदार्थ .... = चिदानन्दसार सर्वाभास भित्तिभूतं हृदयं तत्र निर्भरीकृतं सङ्ग्रहम् ॥

→ बाह्यान्तरतया स्थिताः पदार्था एव,.

स्मृतिसूत्रान्तः = स्मृत्याख्य सूत्रमध्ये

संतत्या = पंक्त्या, (क्रमेण)

ग्रथ्नन्तम् = पूर्वापराभासानुसंधानेन, स्वरूपे तादात्म्येन लीनमपि सन्तं व्यवहारार्थं परिपाट्याऽनुसंधानमिति यावत्

ज्ञान पूर्विका स्मृति = पूर्व और पर काल के ज्ञान के एकीकरण से (स अयं सः) जो स्मृति का प्रादुर्भाव होता है ॥

तदुभयम् = इन दोनों की (ज्ञान और स्मृतिः) ~~जो और~~

अनुग्राहिणी = जो जीवन भूत है

विषयस्वरूपव्यवस्थापकत्वेन ज्ञानस्मृत्योरनुग्राहिणी,

वह 'अपोहन' शक्ति है

वस्तुनः = परमार्थस्य यः संभवः तस्य क्रमेण, एवमेव वस्तु संभवतीति क्रममाश्रित्येत्यर्थः ॥

उपक्रमानुसारेण = प्रक्रियानुरोधने

यः प्रसङ्गः = न किंचिद् अपि भासेतेत्येवंरूपाऽनिष्टापत्तिः -
तस्य यः विपर्ययः = भासते तु तस्मादेतद् अवश्यमङ्गीकर्तव्य-
मित्येवंरूपः
तस्य यः समर्थनम् = दृढीकरणम् , तस्य दृशा.
विवेच्या : अवश्यं विचारणीया
उपक्रान्तम् = पूर्वाह्निकारम्भे आरब्धम् , तत्र= तस्मिन
उपक्रान्ते सति,
मा नाम अप उद्पादि = मा उत्पद्यताम, तत्र एतावन्मात्रस्य
सूचनादिति भावः,

कि केवल संस्कार मात्र से ही स्मृतिः सिद्ध है ← तथाभूतः = परमार्थभूतः, यो भवताऽभ्युपगतो भगवाण,
ज्ञानादि शक्तियुक्तः परमात्मा,
तस्य प्रभावः = माहात्म्यम् , एनाम् = स्मृतिम्
भगवत् के प्रभाव से भी इस नय से स्मृतिः
की सिद्धि नहीं हो सकती है॥
निरूपणाय = प्रदर्शनेन,
स्वलक्षणम् = अन्याननुयायि वस्तु रूपम्
प्रकाशन सामर्थ्यमुक्तम = यह ~~सामर्थ~~ सामर्थ — ऐसा प्रकाशन
करना - स्मृति से ही है॥
तद्विषयेण = पूर्वानुभव विषयेण
तादात्म्य ← एकीभाव पर्यन्त आवेशः = एकीभावासान: समावेशः
न विषयतया स्मृत्या प्रकाशनम् = विषयतया पृथक् न भाति,
वदता = इति आचार्येण दृढीकृतः ← उपोद्धलितः
अनुभवस्य = ~~अ अ अ~~ पूर्व अनुभव ज्ञानको , स्मृत्या = स्मृति द्वारा
पृथग्विषयीकरणम् = स्मृतौ अनुभवस्य वेद्यतया भाने,
इदन्तया भेदेन ज्ञानम्
अवास्तवीकृतम् = काल्पनिकत्वात्
न ~~वास्त्वी~~ वास्तवी कृते

विकल्पेऽपि = सविकल्पज्ञानेऽपि, सति-
ऐकात्म्येन = एकात्मतया - तादात्म्येन भावेन, आवेशः-
प्रवेशः
एकश्चित्तत्त्वविश्रान्तिः = पारमार्थिकमहाप्रकाश
प्रमातरि विश्रान्तिः ॥

It has been proved in the Ah. I + III that the Self (Atman) is a permanent being, who is endowed with the powers of Remembrance, Knowledge & Differentiation. In the actual order of Conscious activity, the power of Knowledge; (ज्ञान शक्ति) precedes the power of Remembrance (स्मरण शक्ति) & the power of Differentiation (अपोहन शक्ति) is antecedant to the both & is their very essence.

The Self (Atman) is the substratum of Smṛti and hence the Smartā. In the former direct perception he receives its Samskāra which subsequently causes the phenomenon of Remembrance. Smartā the remembering Self, is not a fleeting experience but a permanent being behind the experience, even without experiencing the phenomenon of remembrance it self, that being exists.

In this Karika it is explained how the Self functions in the experience of of Smṛti:-

... of the object of former experience, being present at the time of subsequent memory and determinately experiencing as 'that' is said to remember, because he is free.

विमर्शकुर्वाणः ← स हि पूर्वानुभूतार्थोपलब्धा (अनुभव कृतया) परतोऽपि सन्।
विमृशन्स इति स्वैरी स्मरतीत्यपदिश्यते ॥१॥

योजना :- हि (यस्मात्) स्वैरी (स्वतन्त्रः) स परतः (स्मृतिकाले) अपि सन्, पूर्वानुभूतार्थ-उपलब्धा (अनुभवितृतया) 'स' इति विमृशन् स्मृ स्मरति इति अपदिश्यते (कथ्यते) ॥

The Self is free to recall (स्वैरी स विमृशन्) in the state of remembrance (स्मृतिः काले), the knowledge of the object perceived previously. Having perceived the object in the former experience (पूर्वानुभूतार्थोपलब्धा) to recalls the same to memory at a later time (परतः) and determinately knows; "It is the same object ('स' इति विमृशन् स्मृत्य) the Self being ever existing in all the three states, the present, past & future.

पूर्वम् = अनुभवकाले , उपलब्धा = ग्राहकः, अन्तर्मुखः अहमिति स्थितः

बोधः = ज्ञानम्, न तु प्रमाणतया स्थितः इदमिति नहिर्मुखी बोधः Introvert Consciousness

in the introvert sentiency or consciousness has continuous existence till the time of remembrance also.

परतः → स्मृतिः काले , अस्त्येव = न तु नास्ति

अद्यापि = वर्तमानकाले - स्मृ स्मरण वर्तमानकाले - अत्र हेतुमाह → "संविन्मात्र" इति

कालेन = वर्तमानादिभेदयुक्तेण कालतत्त्वेन,

कृतो यः संकोचः → वर्तमानादिनिजभेदपरिच्छिन्नतारूपे संकोचनम्

तद्रूपो यो विशेषः = अवस्था भेदः

तदात्मको योवच्छेदः = अव्यापकता, तस्या अयोगात्
संविदेव हि तत्क्रियावैचित्र्यरूपस्य संवेद्यस्य कालस्यावच्छेदो
न तु तेनाऽस्या इति भावः। उक्ताः
ननु सोऽर्थः स्मृतिकाले नास्तीत्यत आह "अनुभवस्य" इति

That the object is present within the experience as one with it, is of course self established fact — अनुभवस्य ...... अवस्थितम् = यदि हि तदविभागेन पूर्वानुभूतवस्तु संभवो न भवेत कथं स्मरणम् – इति सर्वाकारतालक्षणं स्वातन्त्र्यमस्याः कथितम्॥

तत्तत्वैताते = which are within — चिन्त्यम् = विचारणीय है।
अकालकलिते = कालविच्छेदशून्ये, संवेदते = संविन्मात्रे — Self luminous principle
विश्वत्र भावजाते = विषयीभूतेऽविषयीभूते च भावराशौ।
are experienced as Self luminous — चिन्मयतया परामृशः = अनुसंधानरूपं ग्रहणम्, परमार्थतः स्थितेन चिन्मात्ररूपत्वेन परामर्शनमिति

तत्रापि ...... द्वयी गतिः =
If so, there should be पूर्णेन = the experience of universal (ego) as holding the entire objective world within itself — सर्वभावभारितेन, सर्वं हि भावजातमाधस्पन्दभूतायाम अपरिमिताहन्तायामेव विश्रान्तम्
पृथग्भावावभासनेन = चिद्व्यतिरिक्त चेत्यभावेन भासनरूपया परामर्शः
द्वयी गतिः = प्रकार द्वयम्
द्वयी मतो गतिः = प्रकारद्वयमिति

प्रथमं प्रकारमाह "अहम" इति –, विश्राम्यति = पर्यवस्यति
अहमिदम् इति स्थिता सदाशिवादि दशा तथा,
आदि शब्देनेश्वरदशादेग्रहणम्।

If it does not rest on "I" — न रोहिति = न विश्राम्यति, तत् = तदा
अपूर्वताभासनात् ...... न स्मरणम् = And because there is the consciousness of novelty, therefore it would be direct experience & not remembrance
जब इदन्ता पूर्ण अहंता पर न आरोढ हो, तो केवल इदन्ता का भास है, तदा अपूर्वतया यद्भासते तस्मात् ~~अपूर्वतया~~ "अहम" इत्येव सदातने भासनमिति भावः।
शंका करता है कि पूर्वकालकाल के अनुभूत अर्थ को न भासने पर फिर अनुभव ज्ञान ही रहे और स्मृतिः न रह बने –

*. It means one whose nature it is to employ, without fault, his means for the accomplishment of the end, or he, who employs himself in his work without requiring any other prompter.

इस पर कहता है "स्वैरी" इति

स्वैरी → स्वम् → आत्मीयम् (whose nature is), उपकरणम् = प्रमाणरूपां सामग्रीम् (to employ his means)

(one who employs himself) ईरयति = प्रेरना करे, स्वकर्तव्येषु = प्रमादिरूपेषु निजकार्येषु (in his work)

तच्छीलश्च = वही शोभा सहित

"स्वं" च आत्मानम् ईरयति = जो अपने स्वरूप को (प्रमाणरूप सामग्री द्वारा) जतलावे

न पुनः स्वकर्तव्ये प्रेरकमपेक्षते = अपने कर्तव्य पर किसी दूसरे की प्रेरना करने की अपेक्षा के रहित। (without requiring any other prompter) — इति "स्वैरी" = स्वतन्त्रः

(Because of his freedom ... he has the "that") "स" इति विमृशति = विमर्शं करोति

'स' इति विमर्शस्य स्वरूपम् — "सर्वथा" न इति

(And the essential nature of the ... "that" is that it is not ...) अहं शब्दवाच्य व्यापक चिद्रूप परामर्श मात्रं केवलं न,

अत्यन्तं भेदेन विमर्शनम् = इदमिति विमर्शनम् —

पुनस्तस्य किम् रूपमित्यत आह "अपि तु" इति

(the experience of the pure ... which is entirely free from limitations of time, nor is it that of something which is altogether different from the Subject (i.e. pure object) but that of the object ... at the time of ... direct experience was ... from the ... Self ... dual subject ... limited by time ... place of the former perception ...)

तद्देशकालम् = अनुभव संबन्धिदेशकालावच्छिन्नम्,

यत् परमात्मान्तरम् = परिमितः प्रमाता,

तस्य साचिव्येन = अवष्टंभेन, पृथक्कृतः = अपोहनशक्त्या भेदेनावभासितः

न च अहन्तायामेव लीनीकृतः" इति

अन्यथा तद्विषयस्मृत्यभाव प्रसङ्गाद् इति भावः

तस्य = संस्कारतया स्थितस्य भावस्य, तम् = तमरूपम्

अपहस्तयति = सादृश्यदर्शनाद्यवष्टंभेन येन तदुद्भूतिः स्यात् इति भावः

पृथक्कृते एव = "अहम्" वाच्य शब्द चिन्मात्राद् भिन्नीकृते एव, इदंपरामर्शविषयतया —

पूर्ववदेव = अनुभवकालवदेव —

"नैवम्" — गुरु कहता है नहीं इस रूप से नहीं —

wrapped up in darkness as if it were and (iii) which is before it by his word (अहंकार) when therefore, that power of darkness is removed from his object it shines as before, as different from the subject.

तस्य भोक्तृ निजस्वरूपयोगः

तदानीन्तन = पूर्व अनुभवकालेन, स्थितिः कालेन. → अवभासत्

परिच्छेदविषयता

पृथक्कृत = भिन्नत्वेन, अवच्छेदशरीरादिसंबन्ध = आकार, देश-कालादिः

अनवधूयैव = ऐसे संबन्ध को न छोडते हुये।

तत्प्रकाशः = तस्य स्मर्यमाणस्य प्रकाशः ॥

इदानीन्तन = स्मृतिकालिक

तदानीन्तनावभासेन = अनुभवकालीन ज्ञानेन

वर्तमान काल का परामर्श भी जारी रहता है।

न विमीलति = न तिरोभवति

∴ एतत्परामर्शाभित्त प्रधान्येन = स्मृतिकालपरामर्शाधार तया भवति

स इति परामर्शः — विरुद्धौ = कालभेदेन परस्परं विरोधयुक्तौ, यो पूर्वापर परामर्शौ अनुभवकालीन स्मृतिकालीनौ परामर्शौ

∴ = Because it shines as associated with the body, time & place of the first perception, because of which it was differentiated from the universal subject "I am"

तौ स्वभावः = एकीभूय स्वरूपं यस्य तादृशः।

And for this very reason it is that the consciousness of its shining at the present time of remembrance does not altogether disappear.

एव उच्यते = अतो योग्यतया तेनैवात्र भासनम् इति भावः

∴ (यतः पूर्वानुभूतभावस्वरूपानुसारेण प्रकाशोऽपि वर्तते परामर्शश्च, तत एव स्मृतिकालपरामर्शाभित्तिप्रधान्येन पूर्वकालपरामर्श इति संक्षेपः)।

स एव = स्वैरी एव।

There is therefore, consciousness of the time of the past direct experience associated with the present time of remembrance, the latter predominates.

एवंप्रकार परामर्श ...... मायाप्रमातृभावपरिग्रहः =

तस्य परमेश्वरस्य ~~स्मृ~~ स्मर्तृभूतपरिमितप्रमातृभावासादनमेव स्मर्तृत्वम्, न तु परिमितप्रमातृवत् परमार्थतः ~~स्मरण~~ स्मरणकर्तृत्वेनेति भावः,,

बाह्यव्यवहारानुप्राणकत्वेन स्थितस्य अस्य स्मरणस्यैव परमात्मप्राप्तिं प्रत्यपि साधकत्वं कथयति ॥

इति मायाविद्याद्वयाद्वयम् यम् इदम् = अद्वयचित्तत्त्वस्य द्वयरूपस्मृतिभावग्रहणाद् हेतु इति यावत्।

And thus it is and alone remembrance. His consciousness is nothing else than the form of limited subject such as is fit to be affected by time & place etc. & necessary for the consciousness of this kind.

माया = मायातत्त्वम्, विद्या = शुद्धविद्यातत्त्वम्

तद्रूपं यद् द्वयाद्वयम्, तत्र मायाया भेदकत्वेन द्वयत्वं विद्यायास्तदपसारकत्वेन च अद्वत्वम्

द्वयाद्वयमयम् = तद्रूपम्, तत एव = द्वयाद्वयरूपत्वेन,

26

2. The compound ending in Trn. (पूर्वानुभूतार्थोपलब्धा) specially indicates i, that the direct experience is related to time through its object (ii) that it rests on object (iii) that the experience rests on both object and subject

सकला याः सिद्धयः = बाह्याभ्यन्तरत्वेन स्थिता द्विविधा सिद्धयः,

the subject तासां यद्वितरणम् = प्रतिपादनम्, तत्र मुतरो यः चिन्तामणिः

both as one with & separate from it; because the compound is of the type of एकार्थी भाव·

तस्य प्रकथम - तत् सद्भयम्, तत्र द्वयारुयेन रूपेण बाह्यसिद्धिहेतुत्वम् अद्वयेनान्तरसिद्धिहेतुत्वम् इति क्रम आश्रयणीयः

आगमिकाः = द्विवद्मासवज्ञाः,

तथा मन्त्रादिभिः प्राणितम् = उच्चारादिद्वारेण उपोद्बलितम्,
= शुद्धविधा परमपी प्राणितम्,

तृन्नन्तसमासेन = पूर्वानुभूतार्थमुपलब्धा इति विग्रहेण तृन्प्रत्ययान्तसमासेन.

पूर्वानुभूतार्थोपलब्धा = इत्यस्य समासस्याभिप्रायमाह "अनेन इति"

अनेन = सूत्रस्थेन, यत्नतः = समासनिषेधेऽपि "द्वितीया श्रितातीत" इत्यत्र सूत्रे योगविभागरूपयत्नात्, कृतेनेति शेषः।

अनुभवस्य = पूर्वानुभवस्य, अर्थमुखेन = विषयद्वारेण

पूर्वानुभूतम्, इत्यत्र अनुभवांशे कालस्पर्शम् = अकालकलितत्वेऽपि निष्ठावाच्यातीतकालस्पर्शम्

← अर्थविश्रान्तताम् = प्रमातरि विश्रान्तत्वेऽपि विषये विश्रान्तिं नीलमुत्पलमिति वत्

तथा द्वयोरपि = अनुभवार्थयोरपि, प्रमातरि = उत्तरपदार्थभूते प्रधाने उपलब्धरि

निरूढिम् = विश्रामम्

भेदाभेदाभ्यां दर्शयति = तत्र भेदेन अनुभवस्य कालस्पर्शार्थविश्रान्तिप्रच, अभेदेन तु उत्तरपदार्थप्रधानत्वात् तत्पुरुषस्य द्वयोः प्रमातरि विश्रान्तिः इति क्रमो योजनीयः ॥

वृत्तौ = समासे, अनेकार्थानामेकार्थीभावो यस्मिन् एकार्थीभावः तस्मात्, समासे परस्परं भेदेन स्थितानि पदानि एकीभवन्ति ॥

कुत एकार्थीभावस्य भेदाभेदत्वम्, इत्यत आह "तस्य च" इति

तस्य च = एकार्थीभावस्य च, वक्ष्यामः = अग्रे संबन्धनिर्णये इति भावः॥

—o—

ननु पूर्वश्लोकेनैव स्मृतिसमर्थनं कृतमिति किमर्थमन्ये श्लोका इत्यत आह "एतदेव" इति.

उपपादयितुम् = उपपत्त्या दृढीकर्तुम्,

तत्र = श्लोकान्तरमध्ये, काश्चित् = कोऽपि बौद्धादिः;

अनेन = विकल्पेन

अर्थासंस्पर्शिनः = स्वलक्षणात्मनोऽननुगामित्वेन – अजनकत्वेन तत्र अनवभासात्॥

क्षणरूपवस्तुस्पर्शरहिताः, तत्संतानावसायमात्रपरत्वात्

ननु स पूर्वानुभव एव पुनस्ते प्रकाशयत्वित्यत आह 'येन' इति

कीर्तिमात्रमूर्तिजातः = नष्ट इत्यर्थः

ननु स्मृतिरेव तमनुभवं प्रकाशयत्वित्यत आह "न च" इति

सोऽपि = पूर्वानुभवोऽपि, अत्र हेतुमाह "ज्ञान" इति

असत्त्वाच्च = प्रध्वंसाभावविषयत्वात्

इति = अतः कारणात्, ते प्रति = बौद्धादिकं प्रति

The following verses explain this very remembrance. Here if anybody were to say (i) that remembrance is determinate knowledge, the object therefore cannot be made manifest by it, because the determinate knowledge does not touch the object & that (ii) the direct experience by which it was made manifest by remembrance, firstly because one knowledge cannot make another manifest & secondly because it has no manifest existence at the time of remembrance. Hence there being no manifestation of the object, it again follows that the consciousness "I remember this" is simply an illusion. The following is the reply to him.

① Sholoka. No 2

It has to be admitted that in definite remembrance there is a clear consciousness of the object, otherwise it will be no better than the state of deep sleep or that of unconsciousness. Therefore, in view of the fact that there is a clear consciousness of the object (in remembrance) it has, as a matter of course, to be admitted that the object shines in it. For, if the object of knowledge be not shining, the mental reaction (ग्रहणव्यापारः) will be as good as blind. And this shining of the object is neither altogether associated with or disassociated from the time of first experience. For, in both cases there is danger that the consciousness would assume the form "this". Therefore, the consciousness of the time of the past experience, as associated with the object of former direct experience, is necessary in relation to the object of remembrance; because it (time) determines the object and also because (in remembrance) there is emphasis on the object of former direct experience. Similarly the consciousness of time associated with body and prāṇā of the rememberer is necessary in relation to the subjective aspect; because in remembrance there is equal emphasis on the time of the present experience. The essential nature of the

~~P.T.O.~~ 2nd page

of the object is mere "Ābhāsā" i.e. the object is nothing but a mere limited manifestation, because the means of right knowledge operate on each limited manifestation. This very limited manifestation (e.g. jar), being connected with other manifestation (e.g. gold or any other metal of which the jar is made) becomes clearly manifest like the co-existing rays of thousand lamps. But even when there is no connection with other limited manifestations, the manifestation is still limited, because of its connection with the manifestation of time. That the power of the time is the only differentiator will be explained later on.

Thus the manifestation of jar is determined, because it is related to the manifestation of time; associated with the manifestation of the body (of jar) at the time of former perception.

Remembrance often refers to an isolated Ābhāsā (in this case it is not very clear). But it becomes perfectly clear, when its object is mixed up with other manifestations (which are its attributes) Even when it is perfectly clear, its association with the former time is not broken; because remembrance is an experience, the object of which is not common to other subjects.

(3)

But that object of remembrance, which shines in common to many individual subjects, as in the case of with the object of remembrance of a yogin, is a creation of a yogin. In the case of talk with Brahman, (see spiritualists ... concentration, the object, the deity, appears in a physical form) the manifestation is new. In this case the charm of remembrance of the essential nature of Brahma etc as known through other means of right knowledge, such as Agama etc is simply a means.

The use of the injunctive 'Lan' in अभिन्न? ... in felicity. It is not that it does not shine; on the contrary, it does certainly make it shine. 'In its time' (स्वकाले) means 'at the time of remembrance'. "Cognising" (अवगृह्य) the present time associated with the subjective aspect of remembrance is indicated. By the "determinate object of former experience" (पूर्वानुभूतं स्वलक्षणम्), the past time, associated with the object of knowledge in isolation, has been indicated as responsible (2) for the delimitation of Jar as such. This is the chief characteristic of remembrance.

(1) ... it is a form ... all attributes (2)

Its clearness depends upon the intensity of desire. This is what the word (अवगृह्य) indicates. The same is asserted by the word "in its entirety"

But that object of remembrance, which thus is known to many individual subjects [illegible] of such an object [illegible], is a creation of a [illegible] [illegible] mind,

Cleverness depends upon [illegible] of desires

([illegible]) [illegible] remember-ing, the object, in reality, appears as a physi-cal form) the manifestation is seen in the same. The chain of remembrance of this essential nature of [illegible] through other means of [illegible], such as [illegible] etc. is simply a [illegible].

The use of the [illegible] 'tat' in [illegible] [illegible]. It is not that [illegible] on the contrary, [illegible] certainly make it [illegible], 'that' ([illegible]) mean 'at the time of remembrance', "cognizing" ([illegible]) the present time associated with the subjective aspect of remembrance is indicated. By the "[illegible] object of former experience" ([illegible]), the past time, associated with the object of knowledge [illegible], [illegible] indispensable [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible]. Such is the chief characteristic of remembrance.

Page 123. Karika (2).

एवं च ...... यत् सोऽर्थः प्रकाशते = Therefore in view of the fact that there is a clear consciousness of the object (in remembrance) it has to be admitted that the objects shines in it.

अप्रकाशमाने ...... अन्धप्रायः स्यात् = For, if the object of knowledge be not shining, the mental reaction (अध्यवसायाः) will be as good as blind

प्रकाशने च ...... अवभासन प्रसङ्गात् = And this shining of the object is neither altogether associated with nor dissociated from the time of first experience, for, in both the cases there is danger that the consciousness would assume the form "this".

तस्मात् अतीतानुभवकालः ...... विमर्शांशाभिनिवे-
------ = Therefore, the consciousness शित्वेन = of the time of past experience, as associated with the object of former direct experience, is necessary in relation to the object of remembrance; because it (time) determines the object and also because in remembrance there is emphasis on the object of former direct experience. Similarly the consciousness of time associated with body and prāṇa of the rememberer is necessary in relation to the subjective aspect, because in remembrance there is equal emphasis on the time of the present experience.

आभासमात्रं हि भावस्य ...... स्फुटीभवति =
The essential nature of the object is mere "Abhasa" i.e. the object is nothing but a mere limited manifestation, because the means of right knowledge operate on each limited manifestation. This very limited manifestation (e.g. jar)

P.T.O.

being connected with other manifestations (e.g. gold or any other metal of which the jar is made) becomes clearly manifest like the co-existing rays of thousand lamps.

आभासान्तरव्यामिश्रणाभावेऽपि .... वक्ष्यते =

But even when there is no connection with other limited manifestations, the manifestation is still limited, because of its connection with the manifestation of time. That the power of time is the only differentiator will be explained later on.

एवं तावत् स्वलक्षणीभाव: .... घटाभासस्य इति =

Thus the manifestation of jar is determined because it is related to the manifestation of time, associated with the manifestation of body (jar) at the time of former perception.

तावत्येव .= Remembrance often refers to an isolated Abhāsa — in this case it is not very clear.

आभासान्तरैरपि .... अतिस्फुटा = But it becomes perfectly clear, when its object is mixed up with other manifestations (which are its attributes).

अत्यन्तस्फुटी .... अनवभासनात् = Even when it is perfectly clear, its former association with the former time is not broken; because remembrance is an experience, the object of which is not common to other subjects.

यथावभासे तु .— निर्मीणमेव = But that object of remembrance, which shines in common to many individual subjects as is the case with the object of remembrance of a Yogins, is a creation.

(3)

of a yogin.

ब्रह्मभाषितादौ .... अभ्युपायः = In the case of the talk with Brahman, the manifestation is new. In this case the chain of remembrance of the essential nature of Brahma etc as known through other means of right knowledge, such as Agamas etc, is simply a means.

"भासयेत" .... अपि तु भासयत्येव इति = The use of injunction "Lin" in "भासित" indicates infallibility. It is not that it does not shine; on the contrary, it does certainly make it shine.

"स्वकाले" means at the time of Remembrance.

"अमृशन्" इति ----- उक्तः = By the word "Cognising" the present time [illegible] associated with the subjective aspect of the remembrance is indicated.

By the word "पूर्वाभासित स्वलक्षणे" — "Determinate object of the former experience" — the past time associated with the object of knowledge in isolation has been indicated as responsible for the delimitation of "jar" as such.

इयदेव स्मृते : --- वपुः = This is the chief characteristic of Remembrance.

अभीताातिशयात् तु स्फुटत्वम् = The clearness depends upon the intensity of desire. This is what the "अभि" indicates.

"अखिलात्मा" — "in its entirety" — This word also indicates the same assertion i.e. in a form unified with all attributes.

Now the question arises that Smṛti, being Vikalpa (determinate knowledge) cannot make the object manifest in its real nature. The direct experience which cognises the object in the past perception, becomes a matter of past time at the later time of remembrance. The subsequent remembrance cannot therefore make the former perception manicept, because one cognitive experience cannot be known by another and because the former cognitive experience (direct perception) ceases to exist at the time of the later remembrance (स्मृति). Thus the knowledge, "I remember this" is mere illusion, since the object is not manifest in remembrance. The teacher answers this objection as :-

भासयेच्च स्वकाले ऽर्थात्पूर्वाभासितमामृशन् ।
स्वलक्षणं घटाभासमात्रेणाथाखिलात्मना ॥२॥

योजना :- (स्वैरीस) अर्थात् (सामर्थ्यात् - स्मृत्यशक्त्या) पूर्वाभासितम् स्वलक्षणम् (स्वाऽन्याऽननुयायि स्वरूप-सङ्कोचभागि - लक्षणम्) आमृशन् स्वकाले (स्मरणकाले) घटाभासमात्रेण अथ अखिलात्मना (सर्वाभासमिश्रेण वपुषा) भासयेत च ॥

Eng :- The Subject (Atman) knows determinately (āmarṣan), by the power of remembrance (arthāt - smṛtya - śaktya), that the object that was made

made manifest to him before, i.e., in the former experience (पूर्वाभासितम्) becomes manifest again (भासयेच्च) at the subsequent time of remembrance (स्वकाले - स्मरण काले) either as mere manifestation of it self (स्वलक्षणं) say as jar (घटाभासमात्रेन) or as comprising the entire group of attributes (अखिलात्मना).

By the expression "स्वलक्षणं", the teacher means that the manifestation of the object perceived in the past experience reappears, in the later remembrance, as a new manifestation, giving up its indeterminate universal character identical with the supreme Consciousness and thus becoming limited (संकुचित:) in that state.

The expression "अखिलात्मना" implies that the knowledge of the former perception and that of the later remembrance are unified in the later state.

It has to be admitted that in definite remembrance there is clear consciousness of the object, otherwise it will be no better than the state of deep sleep or that of unconsciousness.

अर्थ: = पूर्वानुभूतो घटादि विषय:, अध्यवसीयते = उल्लेख विषयतां नीयते.

अन्यथा = अध्यवसायाभावे

स्यात् स: = स स्मृति विकल्प, अध्यवसाय विषयी भवति पूर्वानुभूतेऽर्थे, अध्यवसात्वये =

तदानीन्तरकालस्य = अनुभव कालस्य

त्यागेन = तस्य त्यागे हि स्मृति कालस्यैव प्रकाश विशेषणतापत्त्या स्फुटम् - "इदम्" इति अवभास प्रसङ्ग:.

And this shining of the object is neither altogether associated with or dissociated from the time of first experience.*

— cases there is danger that the consciousness would the form as "this" —

नापि स्वीकारेण "इदम्" इति = स्वीकारे तु तत्रस्थस्य "इदम्"
इति प्रवभासस्यापि स्वीकार प्रसङ्ग इति भावः ॥

तस्मात् = ततो हेतोः, प्रतीतानुभवकालः = पूर्वानुभव-कालः,

पूर्वानुभूतस्य भावस्य = घटादेः

स्वलक्षण...... = यत्स्वलक्षण्यम् अन्यानुयायिस्वरूपत्वम्,
तस्य, प्राक्षेपकत्वेन = प्रवच्छेदकत्वेन

अपेक्षणीयः = विशेषणत्वेनाश्रयणीयः

वेद्यभागे = स्मृते विषयरूपे अंशे

प्रकाशात्मको योवभासः = पूर्वकालीनोवभासः

तत्र अभिनिवेशः = हठोस्यास्तीति तादृशः, तस्य भावस्तत्ता-तया,

संयोगेन ←

यतः पूर्वकाले घटस्य स्वलक्षणे प्रकाशिते स एव, स घट इत्यपि स्मृतिविषयी भवत्यातो घटाख्यविषय-विषये विशेषणत्वेन स एव कालोऽपेक्षणीय इति संक्षेपः ॥

ननु वेदकभागे कोऽपेक्षणीय इत्यत आह "स्मृत" इति,

स्मर्तुः देहप्राणादि = अर्थात् स्वरूपम्, तस्यावभासकालश्च, स्मृति-कालश्चेति यावत्

अवलम्बनीयो = वर्तमानं यो गृहीतो, विशेषत्वेनाश्रयणीयः,

वेदकभागे = वेदकांशे, सम्प्रोशे

केन कृत्वा? विमर्शांशे = अद्यतनपरामर्शाख्ये भागे, तदभि-निवेशित्वेन,

(यतः परामर्शकारी स्मर्ता स्मृतिकाल एव संभवति ततः स्मृतिकाल एव वेदकविशेषणत्वेनाश्रयणीयः)

(ननु घटस्य स्वरूपमत्र नास्ति कथमस्य वेद्यत्वं) आह —

आभासमात्रम् = न तु मृत्कार्यत्वेन स्थितं स्थूलं वस्तु,

भावस्य = घटादिपदार्थस्य, प्रत्याभासम् = आभासे आभासे सर्वेषु घटश्च तत् धर्माद्याभासेष्विति यावत् ॥

प्रत्यक्षादिः प्रमातृपदात्

प्रमाणस्य व्यापारात् = बहिर्मुखबोधरूपस्य प्रमाकरणस्य प्रवृत्तेः -

(प्रमाणं हि सर्वत्राभासमात्रमेव करोति न तु उपादानभूय-कस्यादि सत्तां करोति,) ~~ततः प्रमाणकृतमाभास~~

तदेव = भावरूपम् एव, आभासमात्रमेव

ततः प्रमाणकृतमाभासमात्रमेव भावस्य स्वरूपम्, यत्तु मृदादेरुपादानत्वं दृश्यते तदप्याभासमात्रमेव

ननु यद्याभासमात्रमेव भावस्वरूपं तर्हि गलितः स्फुटा-अस्फुटव्यवहारः — आह — "तदेव"

आभासान्तराभिश्रणया = ऊर्ध्वबुध्न्यादि धर्माभास-सम्मिश्रणेन

ननु आभासमात्रत्वे असाधारणधर्माभासग्रहणासंभवात् स्वलक्षणं गृहीतं न स्यादित्यत आह "आभासान्तर" इति

कालाभाससंभेदेन = वर्तमानादि कालरूपाभास संयोजनेन

तस्य आभासस्य = सामान्यरूपघटाभासमात्रस्य,

स्वलक्षणयम् = स्वलक्षणभावम् -

"करोति" इति प्रमाता इति द्वौ द्वोषः

भेदकत्वात् = विशेषणत्वात् ॥

(असाधारणेन भेदकेनैव च स्वलक्षणं व्यवतिष्ठते, कालस्य चासाधारणत्वं घटाभासदेशाद्याभासमिश्री-भावेन स्फुटमेवेति)

उपसंहारं करोति = "एवम्" इति

घटाभासस्य = घटत्वावच्छिन्नस्य आभासस्य

ख्यातिस्फुटा = आख्यान

प्राक्तनः = अनुभवकालीनः, यो देहाभासः = घटदेहरूपाभासः
तस्य यत्साधिण्यम् = सहायता तेन अभ्युदिता या कालाभासा, विशेषणता
तथा स्वलक्षणीभावः भवति ॥

तावत्येव = आभासमात्ररूप एव, घटाभासमात्रे
तदानीन्तनकालता = वेद्यविषया पूर्वकालता
अन्यैः = प्रमातृभिः यत्साधारण्यं तेन यः अवभासः ततो
नहि अन्येन अत्यन्ते स्फुटतया स्वीयमाणो घटोऽन्यस्य ग्रहणविषय इत्यर्थः हेतोः
तथाभासे = साधारण्येनावभासे, तन्निर्माणमेव = तस्य वस्तुनः सम्पादनमेव न तु स्मरणम्
योगप्रभावेण तत्र शक्तित्वात् इति
ननु स्मृतिकल्पिताभिर्देवताभिः सह भाषणादेः का वार्तेत्यत्रे, भावः
'अहं' "ब्रह्म" इति, ब्रह्मणा सह = ध्यानाभ्यासवशेन प्रत्येयतां नीते यत ब्रह्म – ब्रह्मतत्त्वे
तेन सह, भाषितम् = भाषणम्
नवनवेमवाभासने भवति कल्पितत्वात् –
तु = यतः, आगमादिमानान्तरेण = शास्त्रादि प्रमाणान्तरेण,
अनुभूतम् = ध्यानेनानुभवविषयतां नीतम्, यद्ब्रह्मादिस्वरूप तस्य यत्स्मरणम् – परामर्शनरूपा स्मृतिः तस्य या परंपरा सा एव अभ्युपाय – उपायो भवति
न तु पूर्वं प्रत्यक्षीकृतं ब्रह्मतत्त्वं तस्य प्रत्यक्षाविषयत्वात् ॥

नियोगेन = आज्ञया, नियमः = अवश्यम् भावः

ननु = प्रश्न करता है -   एवम् = उक्त नीत्या, जैसे पिछले
                                   श्लोक में कहा गया.

बहि: = भेदेन, इदन्तया

(स्वलक्षण अर्थ जैसे बाहिर इदन्ता, भेद से भासन में आता है - "अयं" से).

एतदेव = केवल इतना ही तो बाहर में अवभासन होता है

प्रकाशनम् = प्रकाश: { स्वलक्षण का बाहिर प्रकाशन यही होता है - 'अयं' से यह "सा" स्मृती के संग जोड की क्या आवश्यकता पडी - ?

The question arises, the expression "स्वलक्षण" denotes that, in remembrance, the picture of the object comes by itself without recourse to the perception. Hence it may be observed that there is a clear difference in formation of the two experiences, perception and remembrance, as in the former the object is present & in the latter the picture occurs itself without recourse to the perception. The teacher replies this objection now as follows :--

Eng :- (Baskari) But if thus the object, limited by the time of its first experience, shines apart from the subject in remembrance, then it should shine as "this". For shining as "this" is nothing else than shining with limitation. To remove this objection the author says as follows:-

न च युक्तं स्मृतेर्भेदे स्मर्यमाणस्य भासनम् ।
तेनैक्यं भिन्नकालानां संविदां वेदितैष सः ॥३॥

योजना :- स्मृतेर्भेदे (स्मृतिविषयस्य अर्थस्य स्मृतेः सकाशात् भेदे) स्मर्यमाणस्य (अर्थस्य) भासनं न च युक्तं, तेन भिन्नकालानां संविदाम् ऐक्यम्, एष सः (संविदाम् एकत्वलक्षणः प्रमाता) वेदिता (इति उक्तम्)

स्मृतेः भेदे, अर्थात् स्मृति विषयस्य अर्थस्य स्मृतेः सकाशात् (८) ॥ इदन्ताग्रहणेन भेदे सति, स्मर्यमाणस्य भासने न च युक्तं स्यात्, सोऽर्थः प्रकाशमान एव स्यान्न स्मर्यमाणः इति भावः, तेन ततः, भिन्नकालानां संविदाम् — अनुभवस्मृत्यादि ज्ञानानाम्, ऐक्यं भवति, एककालत्वात् भिन्नकालस्याकिंचित्करत्वात् । तथा च प्रकाशमानत्वेऽपि स्मर्यमाणत्वमर्थस्य सिद्ध्यति इति भावः। ननु तथापि ग्रहीतुरभावात् कथं सिद्ध्यति इति अत आह 'वेदिता' इति । एष सः — उक्तम् ऐक्यमेव लक्षणया क्रियातद्वतोरैक्यमत् योजकः ऐक्यग्रहीतैव वेदिता ग्रहीता भवति .... Bha I, 166.

If we say that the object of remembrance i.e. the past perception, is different from the knowledge of remembrance, then it is not proper for the former to shine (or occur in Smriti (स्मृतिविषयस्य अर्थस्य स्मृतेः भेदे, स्मर्यमाणस्य भासने न च युक्तं). we must, therefore admit that there is unification of cognitions, associated with different time i.e. the time of the former perception and

that of the later remembrance (तेन भिन्नकालानां संविदाम् ऐक्यं) And, that subject is the knower of these cognition (वेदिता ऐक्यासः)

If that object were to shine apart from remembrance as something external

स्मरणज्ञानात् भिन्नत्वेन = स्मरण ज्ञान से अलग हो कर—

बहीरूपतया = अर्थ बाह्य में - इदन्ता से

यदि ..... = अगर वह स्मर्यमाण अर्थ भासन में आये

It would cease to be object of remembrance

भासेत = अगर वह अर्थ भासन में आये

तदेव ..... वह नहीं हो सकता — वह अर्थ तो स्मर्यमाण नहीं कहला सकता -

It would become object of percept.

अनुभूयमानमेव .... = वह तो फिर अनुभव से ही भासन में आता हुवा — "अयं घटः" (अनुभूयमान अर्थ).

But how then the particular is said to shine at all?

ननु ..... फिर इस स्वलक्षण अर्थ का प्रकाशन कैसे होगा ॥

The reply is that it does not shine now, but it shone before & then it did shine externally -

न इदानीं प्रकाशनम् = स्मृति काल में स्वलक्षण अर्थ का प्रकाशन नहीं है किंतु वह प्रकाशन पूर्व काल में प्रकाशन था अर्थ का

तदा च असौ ...... तब ही यह अर्थ बाहिर में अवस्थित था ॥

But if some one were to ask "what happens now (at the time of remembrance)

ननु च ..... = तो स्मृति काल में फिर क्या होता है -

विमर्शनम् = केवल विमर्श ॥ - *We would say "determinate cognition".*

उभयमपि न किंचित् ...... अस्य = उभयस्य, प्रकाशो हि विमर्शनैव प्रकाशो भवति — तो इस से भी क्या हुवा ॥

but both are inter-dependent, both would therefore be as good as nothing.

ननु ..... ततः किम् = But shining of object and the determinate cognition belong to different times — but what of that?

Āhnika 4
Kārikā (No 3½).

If that object were to shine apart from remembrance as something external, it would not be shining as remembered i.e. it would cease to be the object of remembrance; rather, it would become the object of perception. But if any body were to ask: how then the particular is said to shine at all?. The reply is: it does not shine now, but it shone before, & then it did shine externally.

But if any body were to ask "What happens now" (at the time of remembrance) we would say: "determinate cognition". But if the objector were to say that thus it follows that shining of object & its determinate cognition belong to different times. The reply is "what of that"? (The objector:—) Because they are interdependent, both would, therefore, be as good as nothing (because one will have been destroyed long before the other's coming into existence). (The reply). Not so. No doubt, the Buddhist, according to whom there is no other reality than different momentary cognitions, cannot satisfactorily reply to this objection. But, according to our system of philosophy, the subject introvertly determines (Vimarśati) the various cognitions which are not dissociated from the time of their rise, by unifying them into one whole. Thus the former experience

shine objectively as associated with past time and the subjective reaction to it (Vimarśa) shines as associated with the present time, the limiting condition of the introvert subject. The distinction of the cognizer from mere cognition (vedana) lies in this that he is free in uniting or separating as various cognitions according to his will. It is in this that his power as "doer" consists. The unification, as expressed in "I experience or "that jar" is non-different from the uni-fier. This is what is indicated by the concord between "the unification" and "that knower" (i.e. the unification is the same as the subject) By means of the expression "it is that" the subject, who was concealed as it were, has been brought to clear light as "this". Thus, by the statement, sma-ching of wonder, recognition has been indicated. This is what the Author himself has asserted in the following:- "I have brought to clear light the essential nature of the Subject, which was soiled by those who talked all kinds of irrelevant things about it & who denied their own experience, after silencing them by means of clear arguments. (3)

Buddhist according to whom there is no other reality than the different momentary cognition cannot satisfactorily reply this objection.

अप्रतिसमाधेयम्

तस्य = बौद्धस्य   यस्य हि संवेदनान्येव .... अप्रतिसमाधेयमेव = जिस बौद्ध के यह ज्ञान भिन्न भिन्न हैं और क्षणिक हैं वह इस बात को सिद्ध नहीं कर सकता क्योंकि वह समाधान नहीं कर सकता है ॥

But according to our philosophy the subject introvertly determines the various cognitions, which are not dissociated from the time of their rise by unifying them into one whole.

कालात्यागेनैव = भासमानाया भिन्नकालताया त्यागाभावेनैव स्थितेन

एकताभवभासनेन = सारभूतेन किंचिद्रूपान्तर प्रमातृतत्त्व अपेक्षया सिद्धेन एकतायाः स्फुरणेन, तद्भावेन इति यावत् ॥

स्वतन्त्रः = स्वरूपभूतसंविदां संयोजने वियोजने च स्वतन्त्र युक्तः, प्रमाता भवति अर्थात् स एव प्रमाता,

Thus the former experience shines objectively as associated with past time and the subjective reaction to it (vimarsha) shines as asso with the present time, the limiting condition of the introvert subject.

यावत् = यस्मिन् क्षणे एव , अन्तरमुखतया = अन्तरमुखेन "अहम" इति यावत्

तावत्पदे = तद्भविष्यमाण स्मृतितायाम् स्वांशे ॥

अंशं = अर्थे

परामृशति = "अहम" इति परामर्शं करोति स्वप्रकाशत्वात्,

तावत् = तत्क्षणादेव , प्रकाशस्य = पूर्वानुभवस्य

तात्कालिक बहिर्भावावभासो = परामर्शावकाशदायी स्वकालीन इदन्तावभासः भवति ॥

विमर्शस्य = परामर्शस्य, इदानीन्तन = स्मृतिकालीना,

अन्तरमुखा = अहंरूपा , स्थिति भवति ,

ज्ञातृत्वे ज्ञानेभ्योधिके

एतदेव = स्वांशविषयमहमिति विमर्शनमेव,

वेदनाधिके = प्रमाणरूपाद् बहिर्मुख ज्ञानाद्धिकम् -

करणं = कारणरूपम् - तदुक्तम् :-

भासने

"स्वातन्त्र्यमथ कर्तृत्वं मुख्यमीश्वरतापि च"

The distinction of the cogniser from mere cognition (वेदना) lies in this that he is free in uniting or separating various cognitions according to his will. It is in this that his power as "doer" consists.

The unification "घटमहमन्वभूवम्" ("I experienced that jar") is non-different from the unifier.

बहिर्भावावभासः पूर्वानुभवस्य स्मृतिबोधैक्येन प्रतिपादनं

* "घटमहमन्वभूवम्" इति विस्तरेण परामर्शः
"स घट" इति तु संक्षेपेण, ऐक्यम् = ऐक्यरूपम्.

* (घटमहमन्वभूवम् इत्यत्र पूर्वानुभवस्य स्मृतेर्बोधैक्येन प्रतिपादनम् स घट इत्यत्रापि अर्थ एव पृथग्भूतो भाति, अनुभवस्तु तदानीमर्थोपसर्जनभावेन स्फुरन्नपि तदुत्तीर्ण इव इदंता परामर्श संस्पर्शाक्षमः अहंमात्रविश्रान्ति-सतत्त्वः, तस्य तु स इति स्फुर इति इति च परामर्शः तदनुभाव्य धर्मोपचारेण व्यवहारमात्रमिति भावः॥

"ऐक्यं स स्व वेदिता'.... इत्यादि" This is what is indicated by the Concord between "the unification" & that "Knower" i.e. the unification is the Same as the Subject.

अनुसन्धानम् = भिन्नप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तयोरेकार्थनिष्ठत्वम्. एकविभक्तिकत्वतश्च सामानाधिकरण्यम्॥

"एष सः" → By means of the expression "it is that" the Subject who was concealed as it were has been brought to clear light as "this".

अनया उक्त्या = प्रत्यभिज्ञा एव सूचिता.

स्फुटावभासने कृतम् = प्रत्यभिज्ञा च विस्मृतस्य प्रत्यक्षीकरणमेव

Thus by the Statement Smacking of wonder, recognition has been indicated

इत्थं = इस तरह, स्वसंवित्तिम् = अपने अनुभव प्रकाश का

अपह्नुवाने = जो इस को नही मानते हैं

यत्तद् = जो जो कुछ (वह) वदद्भिः = बोलते हैं

कुलङ्कीकृते यत् = जिस प्रमातृ तत्त्व को उन्होंने अपने विकल्पों से मलिन बनाया है

तान् = उन ही वादियों के लिए (जो)

मूकान् = गूंगे हैं - स्फुटयुक्तिभिः = साफ और सरल युक्ति से

विधाय = करके

प्रकटीकृते = प्रकट किया (प्रत्यभिज्ञा से)

तत् = वह प्रमातृ तत्त्व ॥

ननु च .... प्रकाशः := प्रश्न करता कि अगर स्मृति से पूर्वानुभूत अर्थ ही बाह्य में अवभासित होता है (यानी स्मर्यमाण अर्थ का अवभासन) -

तर्हि .... = तो ऐसा क्यों न कहें कि वह अनुभव (प्राच्य अनुभूत अर्थः) स स्मृति विषय करे -

ऐक्येन .... = यह सब ज्ञानों का एकीभाव होना ऐसी अलौकिक बात क्या मानी रखती है ॥

On this point, another objection is raised :- If the light of the object externally manifested by the later remembrance is not other than the former perception itself, why should we not simply say that the former experience is the object of remembrance? What is the use of this odd and uncommon expression "unification of cognitions". The teacher thereupon says :-

*. नैव ह्यनुभवो भाति स्मृतौ पूर्वो ऽर्थवत्पृथक् ।
प्रागन्वभूवमहमित्यात्मारोहण-भासनात् ॥४।

योजना :- स्मृतौ पूर्वो अनुभवो अर्थवत् (अनुभूत अर्थवत्) पृथक् (-भूतो) नैव भाति हि, कस्मात् कारणनात्? "प्राग् अन्वभूवम् अहम्" इति (प्रत्ययस्य) आत्मा-आरोहण (आत्मनि विश्रमना, तेन हेतुना) भासनात् ॥

*. It is not so. For the former experience does not shine separately in remembrance as "this" like an object. But it shines "as I experienced before" because the experience shines only because of its resting on the subject.

The illustrations are of 2 kinds, positive & negative. Just as "before" i.e. at the time of direct perception, the former object jar etc., shone separately as "this" So at the time of remembrance, the former experience does not shine apart from from remembrance. And just as, at the time of remembrance, the object does not shine separately from remembrance there is no external manifestation, so for the very reason, the former experience also does not shine apart from remembrance. How do both shine then? They shine as "I experienced".

एवं दृष्टान्तद्वय योजना। हि - यस्मात्, स्मृतौ पूर्वः अनुभवः पृथक् नैव भाति, कथम्? अर्थवत् - यथा प्राग् अर्थः पृथग् भाति स्म नैव मनुभवः इति! अत्रार्थानुभवगतस्य भावाभावरूपस्य विरुद्धधर्मद्वयस्य साधनात् वैधर्म्यदृष्टान्तत्वम इति एका योजना। अथ द्वितीया। स्मृतौ यथा प्राग् अर्थः पृथग् न भाति तथा स्मृतौ अनुभवोऽपि पृथक् न भाति - अत्र च साधर्म्य दृष्टान्तत्वम्, न भावरूपस्य समान धर्मस्योभयत्र साधनात्॥

Eng: What do you mean by this? The reply is:- The self is essentially "I-consciousness". It is introvert in both experiences, the former & the later. As the self-luminous nature of former experience, shines only as resting on the self, so the jar also, which is merged in that shines as if it were both self luminous - the object & perception rest on the self.

It is not that the former perception shines separately in remembrance, as the object shines in perception (अर्थवत्) It shines as the knowledge (प्रत्ययः) expressed in the words "I experienced it before" because it shines only as resorting to the subject, i.e. the knowledge of the past ~~experience~~ perception is carried to the later remembrance as resting in the Self (प्राग् - अन्वभूवम् - अहं इति आत्मारोहणाभासनात्).

दृष्टान्तः = लक्षणया उदाहरणम् - तत्र प्रथमं वैधर्म्यमेव स्फुटयति "प्राक्" इति।

पूर्व अनुभव के समय जिस तरह "घट" "पृथक्"- इदन्ता से भासन में आया था स स्मरण काल में यह "घट" "पृथक्"- इदन्ता से नहीं भासन में आता है किंतु यह केवल स्मृति को इस अर्थ "घट" का ज्ञान (knowledge) होता है याने 3 स्मृति से अलग

नही भासता है (वैधर्म्य दृष्टान्तः).

यथा च = साधर्म्य दृष्टान्तः .... स्मृति काल में पूर्व अनुभव कालिक अर्थ - "घटः" स्मृति से भिन्न - अलग नही (इदन्ता) से नही भासन में आता क्योंकि स्मृतिकाल में अर्थ केवल ज्ञान रूप से स्मृति में होता बाहिर इदन्ता से "घट" का अभाव होता है - (साधर्म्य दृष्टान्तः).

एवं = एवं स्थिते सति , हेतोः = बहिरवभासाभावरूपात्

न भेदेन = स्मृति से भिन्न., उभयं = पूर्वानुभवः पूर्वार्थश्च
नहि अत्र अभाने युक्तमिति भावः,

अत्र आह — "अत्वभूवम्" — एवं प्रकारेण भातीत्यर्थः।

"अहम" इति .... = अहमर्थ स्वभाव इत्यर्थः

अर्थानुभवस्मृति अहमिति संविद् स्वरूपः अनुसं- धाता — आत्मा॥

पूर्वापर ..... = अर्थानुभवस्मृती, पूर्वापरसंविद्रूपश्चासावन्तर्मुखश्च

तत्स्वभावः = तत्स्वरूपः — एतेन "अत सातत्यगमने" — सातत्यगमने हि नित्यत्वं तदेव च पूर्वापरकाल-व्यापित्वम्॥

तत्र = तस्मिन्नात्मनि , पूर्वसंविद्रूपतायाः = पूर्वानुभवरूपताय

स्वप्रकाशायाः = स्वप्रकाशत्वेन स्थितायाः

ननु तद्विषयस्य घटस्य कथमारोहणं संभवतीत्यत आह — "तल्लीनस्य" — विषयत्वेन तस्य संविदि लग्नस्य, अन्यथ प्रकाशायोगात्।

घटस्य = विषयी भूतस्य घटस्य

स्वप्रकाशदेशीयत्वेन = आत्मारोहेण भासनं भवति, नहि सत्योत्पलत्वं सितत्वं विहाय कुत्राप्यन्यत्र तिष्ठतीति भावः,

There is a recognised new "Root + personal termination" logic which tells the meaning of the personal termination", i.e. the meaning of root merges in that of personal termination. The perception therefore is merged in the 'I', the Cognizer, who is implied by the number of personal termination, & so is the object also through that (perception). It (object) does not shine independently. For this very reason the object is not separately mentioned in (the verse). But garets do not (directly) rest on the subject at the time of perception. And because the forms perception does not shine separately as an object (in remembrance) for this the reason stated in the 2nd half of the verse, therefore the unification of cognitions has to be admitted in (remembrance).

"आत्मनि च आरोहणं" → . आत्मगता हि संविद्रूपता आत्मनि स्वयमेव आरोहति तद्द्वारेण अर्थोऽपि -

विश्रमणा = विश्रमकरणम् - प्रमाता हि तां संविद्रूपतां तद्विषये च घटादिमात्मन्यारोहति ।

तर्हि कथं न "अन्वभूवम्" इत्यत्र कर्मणो निर्देशः कृत इत्यपेक्षायामाह "प्रकृति" इति, अथवा कथम् "अन्वभूवम्" इत्यत्र अनिर्दिष्टस्य कर्मणः अनुभवद्वारेणात्मनि विश्रम इत्यपेक्षायामाह- "प्रकृति" इति

प्रकृति = अनुभवः
प्रत्ययौ = अहमिति

सह ब्रूतः = एकीभावमासाद्य कथयतः, प्रकृतिः प्रत्ययार्थे ब्रुडति इति यावत

एकवचनेन युगपत

इति न्यायात् = एवं स्थितेन पूर्वाचार्यन्यायेन,

संख्याक्षिप्ते = प्रत्ययवाच्यसंख्यामात्रेण धर्मेण धर्मि धर्मितया आक्षिप्ते, स्वयेव प्रत्ययवाच्यसंख्या- धर्मयुक्ते धर्मिणि वा, ...

देहगत संख्या

अहं में एकवचन है और "अनुभव" और "अहम्" एक साथ अन्वभूवम् से बोले जाते हैं दोनों एक ही पद में स्थित हैं

देहगत संख्या से आक्षेप किया हुवा - इस धर्म से जैसे चार वर्ष का → यह देहगत संख्या है - यही धर्म सहित - यहां धर्मी और धर्म एक वचन से बोले जाते हैं

कर्तृभूते = अनुभवक्रियाकर्तृत्वेन स्थिते

... connected with another word than that with which it comes in the text, because the 'लुङ्' tense (of अनभूवम्) indicates the past. Similar is the connection of "Aham" because the first person in which अनुभूवम् is used emphasis 'I'. The word "आरोहनम्" is to be interpreted as both, having causal affix & without it.

अस्मदर्थे = अस्मच्छब्दरूपाहं शब्दवाच्येऽर्थे "अस्मद्युत्त"

त्रुडितः = लीनीभूतः , तद्द्वारेण = अनुभवद्वारेण च, सः

अर्थोऽपि = तद्विषयभूतो घटोऽपि, त्रुडितः इति योजना।

अर्थं विना अनुभवः स्वात्मरूप एव

ननु तर्हि अनुभवार्थयोः को विशेष इत्यत आह, "न तु" इति

असौ = अर्थः . — अर्थ तो स्वतन्त्र नहीं है -

न हि सितोत्पलमानयेत्युक्ते विशेषणीभूतः सितगुण आनेतुं शक्यत इति भावः। स्वातन्त्र्यास्वातन्त्र्यरूप एवानयोर्भेद इति भावः

एतदवष्टम्भेन कर्मोऽनिर्देशस्य युक्तत्वं कथयति "तदर्थमेव" इति

न हि अयत्नसिद्धे वस्तुनि यत्नापेक्षेति भावः

(ननु "अनभूतोऽर्थः" इत्यादौ अनुभवस्याप्यर्थे विशेषणता दृश्यते एव, विशेषणविशेष्यभावो हि काल्पनिक एव, सत्यम्, अयं विशेषणविषयभावः बाह्यव्यवहारयोग्य एव, बहिरर्थस्य प्राधान्यात् ज्ञानस्य तु गौणत्वात्, आन्तरे व्यवहारे तु ज्ञानस्यैव प्राधान्यमर्थस्य तु अप्राधान्यमित्यलम्॥

ननु तर्हि "घटमनुभवामि" इत्यत्र कथं कर्मनिर्देश — आह —

"घटादि" इति , "न आरोहति" = बहिर्मुखत्वेन गृह्णात्,

अन्यथा "इदम्" शब्दायोगात्

"असु घटम्" इति युक्ति तत्र प्रयोगः

पृथक् = इदन्तया , "पूर्वानुभवः" — प्राक् — जैसे श्लोक में कहा गया है॥

"लुङा" = लुङिति प्रत्ययेन - जैसे अनुभूवम् के (लङ् भूतकाल दिखलाता)

"अन्वभूवम्" इत्यस्य कर्तृत्वेन न वर्तते इति भावः

But who says that direct experience does not shine apart from the rememberer? But if it be said that it does not shine separately, exactly in the manner in which the jar does, then what of that? For, the jar also does not shine separately exactly in the manner of perception. Can it be said therefore that it does not shine separately? Both of them shine separately of course according to their individual nature.

अनुभवः पृथक ...... = कि स्मृति में अनुभव घटवत् पृथक्- इदन्ता से नहीं भासता है?

किं ततः = उस से क्या हानि हुई।

घटोऽपि ..... = घट भी अनुभव की तरह स्मृति में अ[illegible] इदन्ता से नहीं भासता है केवल ज्ञान रूप (knowledge) से भासता है ॥

स्वभावेन भाति = घटवन्न भाति किन्तु स्वरूपेण भासमेव[?]

· द्वाभ्यः[?] स्वभावेन भानेऽनुभवेऽप्य भाते आरोपयति ॥

इति तु = एतत्तु, स्वभावेन भाने समाने भवति, अनुभवस्यापि घटस्वभावेन अभानम्, एतदेव समर्थयितुमुपक्रमं करोति-

तथा हि" इति

"सूक्ष्मादि" → परचित्तमपि योगिज्ञाने विषयी भवति इति संबन्धः। भूतभावि परमाण्वादि ॥

अभ्युपगतम् = अङ्गीकृतम् ॥

∴← प्रत्ययस्य = ~~ओम~~ योगिज्ञानस्य, ~~पर~~ परचित्तज्ञानम् भवति,

इत्यादौ = एवमादौ पतञ्जलिसूत्रे इत्यर्थः

तत्र = समनन्तरोक्ते पातञ्जलसूत्रे, ~~अत्र~~

ज्ञानवृत्त्या = ज्ञानाख्यबुद्धिवृत्तिभावेन, परिणतम् = रूपान्तरं गतम्

सत्त्वम् = बुद्धिरूपं महत्तत्त्वम्, उक्तम् = न तु लोक प्रसिद्धं मनः तस्य संकल्पमात्रनिष्ठत्वेन मनः शब्देन कथनात् ॥

अन्यथा = ज्ञानवृत्तिकथनाभावे, प्रत्ययस्य = परज्ञानस्य,

संयमविषयीकार्यत्वे = योगिप्रणिधानविषयीकरणयोग्यत्वम्

✻ "प्रत्ययस्य परचित्तज्ञानमिति, प्रत्ययस्य संयमात् प्रत्ययस्य साक्षात्करणं, ततश्च परचित्तज्ञानमुत्पद्यते योगिन इति। "न च सालम्बनं तस्या विषयी भूतत्वात्" रक्तं प्रत्ययं जानाति अमुष्मिन्नालम्बने रक्तम् इति न जानाति, परप्रत्ययमात्रं तु योगिचित्तस्य आलम्बनीभूतम् इति पातञ्जलभाष्ये ॥

Said therefore that it does not shine separately? Both of them shine separately of course according to their individual nature. Accordingly, it has been admitted that just as the past, future & subtle etc. is the ... become manifest in the knowledge of a yogin, so does the chita also of another person as in the following— "Through concentration on the affected state of mind one gets the power of knowing the minds of others". Here the word "chita" means Sattva (Budhi), modified by the form of an external object. Otherwise what would be the sense in saying that it is known through concentration & why should there be any question about its relation with the object, as in the following: "And that is without any relation with its object."

view that the Self can be known through inference only, lacks all support of reason. It has already been said that the view that one knowledge is the object of another, leads to argumentum ad infinitum.

Therefore, it has to be admitted that a Yogin knows the cognition of another person in so far as he is aware of a jar and pleasure etc as related to the Self limited by another's body. In this cognition (of another's cognition) the internal objects such as pleasure etc, and the external like jar etc shine as "this" but the light of consciousness, being self-luminous, shines as "Aham" "I" only. Thus, a Yogin in whom the consciousness of distinction of himself from others persists, because of the continuity of the impression of "thisness" associated with the body & prāṇa etc of another person, which he formerly looked upon as a subject (pramātā), attributes the objectivity of the body etc, to the pure subjective aspect "Aham" and therefore, erroneously thinks that knowledge to be the knowledge of another.

In this different kind of knowledge, i.e the knowledge of another's knowledge by Yogin, through meditation, the knowledge of another person does not shine as an object. That is as follows :-.

According to the Budhists, the knowledge (विज्ञान:) is self-luminous in its essential nature. Now if this be the object of another knowledge, then its real nature of shining as self-luminous & not as the object of another knowledge, will be contradicted.

According to Sānkhya System, the "Upalabdhi" is nothing else than the reflection of purusha and he belongs to the category of unknowable. How then can he be the object of knowledge.

According to Vaisheshika System also, the knowledge inheres in the self as identical with it, How then can this knowledge be cognised by the mind that is within the body (of the cogniser)?. But if one were to say: by entering into another body ~~to be its own (for it being Anu cannot be connected with both~~ then it (mind) will naturally take that body to be its own (for it being Anu, cannot be connected with both the bodies) and in connection with that will arise the idea of egoity "Aham". Hence all distinction between one's own self & that of other will disappear. The Vaisheshika

But a yogin, who has risen above the idea of duality, see all as one with himself, realises that the duality is his own creation. Thus cognition is not the object of knowledge of a yogin (therefore one knowledge cannot be the object of another).

And even if we admit that the knowledge of another person becomes an object of that of a yogin, our position will not be affected; because there is no similarity between the perception as it figures in ~~that of a yogin~~ the remembrance & another's knowledge as it figures in that of a yogin. It is as follows:-.

In the case of yogin's knowledge of another's experience, the latter shines as associated with another, as "he experiences" and not as associated with his own self, as "I experience". But in the case of remembrance it (the experience) shines as resting on "I" free from all taint of objectivity. Hence it has rightly been said that because experience does not shine apart from the

experiencer, therefore there fore unification of cognitions of different times and that it is the knower.

...perience of another becomes the object of yogi's experience, so let it one's own knowledge also be the object. To this he replies that the illustration is Asidha. This is what he shows

by that portion which ends in "भान्ति".

संयम: = प्रणिधानम्

"न च सालम्बनामिति" — सालम्बने = सविषयम्

And accepting the illustration to exist, by the rest of the verse, he shows the unsuitability of the illustration to the present case inasmuch as the point of similarity is lacking here.

अयं भाव: = यदि चित्तशब्देन अस्मिन् सूत्रे मनस एवोक्ति: स्यात् तर्हि अन्य सूत्रे आलंबनविषयां प्राङ्कां योगिनां परज्ञाने विषय- ~~संबद्ध~~ संबद्धमेव विषयीकरोतित्यनेन रूपो न कुर्यात् ॥

निजमपि = स्वकीयमनुभवनमपि, सामान्यप्रमाता विषयीक्रियताम् इति, अनुभवत्वाऽविशेषादिति भाव:

दृष्टान्त: = योगिप्रत्ययरूप:

शेषेण = मेयपद इत्यादिना

योगिनामपि भासन्ते न दृशो दर्शनान्तरे ।
स्वसंविदेकमानास्ता भान्ति मेयपदेऽपि वा ॥५॥

योजना — योगिनाम् अपि दर्शनान्तरे (परचित्तविषयो ज्ञान-विशेष:) दृश: (परकीया: दृश:) न भासन्ते, ता स्वसंविद्-एकमाना (स्वसंवित् - मात्रवेद्यस्वभावा: स्वात्मारूढा एव) भान्ति, मेयपदे (प्रमेयकक्षायाम्) अपि वा (स्वात्मारूढा एवाभासेरन्)

Eng: Even in the particular kind of knowledge of yogins, the experiences of others do not become manifest as such (i.e. as others' experiences) but they shine as unified with their own self (Atman), consciousness (संविद्) (संविदेकमाना). Even at the level of objects, the experiences of others are one with the Self-consciousness of the yogin (मेयपदेऽपि वा).

दर्शनान्तरे = और और दर्शनों में जैसे विशेष ज्ञान
कहे गये हैं।

भावनाद्युद्भवः = भूतार्थभावनाप्रकर्षपर्यन्तजः

उद्भवः = प्रादुर्भावो यस्य सः

परचित्तविषयः = अन्य ज्ञान विषयः, ज्ञानविशेषः = अन्य
ज्ञानेभ्योतिशययुक्तं ज्ञानम्

तत्र = तस्मिन् ज्ञानविशेषे दृशः

उपलब्धयः न भान्ति = ज्ञानात् न भानम् एव समर्थयि-
तुमुपक्रमं करोति –

तथ कथं वेद्या स्यात् = उपलब्धिविशेषणम्, नहि प्रति-
बिंबे बिंबविलक्षणे युक्तमिति भावः,

समवाय = गुणत्वेन समवायवृत्त्या स्थितम्,

संवेदनम् = ज्ञानम्. परगतम् = परात्मनि समवेतम्

मनसा, केन कीदृशेन? अन्तःशरीरवर्तिना = शरीर-
अन्तरगतेन

तच्छरीरान्तःप्रवेशे = परशरीरान्तःप्रवेशे

तस्यैव = परशरीरस्यैव, शरीरीकरणात = स्वशरीर-
तया संपादनात्,
अहंभावगृहीतमेव शरीरं
स्वशरीरमिति भावः ॥

अहन्तावभासितत्वात् = परशरीरस्यापि अहन्तया प्रकाशि-
तत्वात्,

आत्मनः = निजात्मनः भेदः = परात्मना सह भेदः

विगलेत् = नश्येत्, इदन्ताग्रहणमात्रस्यैव भेदत्वात्,

तस्मात् = यतो योगिनो दर्शनान्तरे दृशो न भासन्ते, सर्वथा
अभासनञ्च अयुक्तमेव, ततः कारणात्

एतद्देहप्रकाशस्य = परदेहावच्छिन्नप्रकाशस्य

सहचारी = विषयभावेन सहचरणशीलः,

घटसुखादिप्रकाशः = घटसुखादि ~~प्रकाश~~ रूपः प्रकाशो भवति

तत्र = तस्मिन् परचित्तज्ञाने, घटसुखादि = परज्ञानविषयभूतं बाह्यमान्तरं वा वस्तु घटरूपं सुखरूपं वा,
इदन्तया भाति = इदन्ताग्रहणे एव योग्यत्वात् ॥
तद्भूतस्तु = घटसुखादिविषयभूतस्तु।, प्रकाशः = अनुभवः
"अहम्" इत्येव स्वप्रकाशतया = स्वप्रकाशभावेन,
प्रकाशते = तादृक्स्वभावत्वात् ॥
(फलतस्तु भासनापेक्षैव नास्ति सदा स्वात्मत्वेन स्थितत्वात् इति भावः)।
तर्हि कथं "इदं परज्ञानम्" इति कथयत्यसौ इत्यत आह "प्रमात्रीकृत" इति,
प्रमात्रीकृतम् = अच्युत्पन्नत्वेन पूर्वम् अप्रमातृरूपमपि प्रमातृतया संभावितं यत् परदेहप्राणादि, तस्मिन्यः समवभासः = इदन्तया ज्ञानम्,
तस्य यः संस्कारः = पूर्वभ्रामितचक्रभ्रमणरूपः,
तस्मात्, तु, अविगलितस्वपरविभागः = ईश्वरावस्थां न तु सदाशिवादिदशामधिष्ठाताः प्राप्तः,
योगी, तन्निष्ठाम् = परदेहादिविषयाम्
इदन्ताम् = इदंभावम्
इदं परज्ञानम् इति अभिमन्यते = अभिमानेन जानाति, न तु तथा संभवतीति भावः
प्राप्तकर्षः = स्वपरविभागगलनेन प्राप्तातिशयो योगी तु,
सर्वम् = समस्तं वेद्यराशिम्, आत्मत्वेन पश्यन् = "अहम्" इति ग्रहणेन,
स्वसृष्टमेव मन्यते = जानाति, तथा च न तस्यापि ज्ञानान्तरेण परस्य परज्ञानभानमिति भावः ॥

पदार्थस्तु :—

स्वसंवित् = स्वरूपभूता संवित्, एकम् = केवलम्, मानं यासां ताः, स्वप्रकाशा इत्यर्थः

ताः = दृशः, भान्ति = प्रकाशन्ते इति

"मेयपदेऽपि वा" - इति पदं व्याचष्टे "भवतु वा" इति

प्रकृतम् = दृशोऽन्यदृग्वेद्यत्वरूपम् आरब्धं वस्तु, एतत्समम् = योगिदृगन्तरवेद्यदृकसमम्, कुतो न समम् इत्यत आह "तथा" हि

परनिष्ठः = परकर्तृकत्वावच्छिन्नः, एव = एतेन "मेयपदे" = अस्ति इत्यस्य व्याख्या, परस्य मेयत्वात्, पदे - गोचरे, परनिष्ठतयेति यावत्, तदुक्तम्

"स परो यस्तु मीयते"

अनुभवे = परानुभवे, आत्मरोहेण = आत्मविश्रान्त्या, वर्तमानः = आत्मकर्तृकत्वावच्छिन्न इति यावत्।

अनालीढदेभावा = अस्पृष्टेदन्ता

Karika no 6

Introduction: But if it be admitted that perception does not shine apart as an object in remembrance, because of its resting on the Subject (Ahanta), we would point out that there is another type of experience, in which we find a cognition, cognising as perception as 'this' (e.g. "I had that perception"); in which परामर्शान्तरम् clearly shine the perception as resting on the external object like jar, which are rightly experienced as objects. Why not then make use of that analogy?

Shloka:-

The particular experience in which one remembers "I had that perception before" and in which the former perception appears apart from remembrance as its object. (यत् दृष्टम् मे आसीत् इति सा एव न् भेदतः अपि स्वसंविद्यते), is only an analysis of the process of remembrance: 'It was seen by me before. (मया दृष्टम् इति अस्या स्मृतेः तद्व्याकरणमेव)

It is the experience of common people that a person remembers that he had that the knowledge of the past perception just as (एवं) he remembers it now (on the later occasion). This later knowledge i.e. the knowledge of later remembrance, is a different exposition (व्याकरणम्) of the past knowledge

P.T.O.

ie the knowledge of former perception, as is denoted by the words (मया दृष्ट(मिति)). This shows that that the knowledge of the former perception is one with the knowledge of the later remembrance i.e. they are unified in the self-consciousness.

• Commentary :-

Such is not the cognition of the people in general. For they do not think that perception shines apart from remembrance as its object as "I had that experience". Even if we admit that in the case of certain persons, who claim to be great analysts, the remembrance assumes the form, "I had that experience" our position is not affected, for, all that, is simply an elaboration of "I remember". It is an elaboration, based upon analysis, similar to that of a word (explained) into imaginary parts such as root + affix etc, in order to explain its meaning to others. That analyst also, if he be conscious of the original experience "I remember" as the basis of the analysed form of it, as stated above, then he also does not cognise perception as an object; rather he simply assumes ... separate objective existence of perception as in the case of "the head of Rahu", otherwise just as (remembrance) "that jar" refers to something, which was the object of former perception, so in

on page (2)

the case of remembrance "that knowledge" also, there ~~would~~ arise necessity of another former experience. For, by the pronount "that" it is intended that the jar or the experience is the one that has been the object of former experience (instead of "that experience") would have been used. But that would mean I experienced cognition by means of cognition and there ~~was~~ also the case being the same there being necessity of another experience, argumentation ad infinitum would follow.

But what is the original undisputed form of remembrance? I say "was seen by me". But does not this mean that seeing rested on the lotus like face of the wife and so on and not the self, because the past passive particle affix, which requires reference of the action on the object, would not otherwise be possible?. The person who says so apparently does not himself understand what he says. Here the act of seeing is dependent upon the subject. And therefore the in "knife is shown to the servant" the act of seeing is said to be resting on the subject.

P.T.O.

Even the Mimamsakas admit that "Seeing" the essential nature of which is Knowledge and which is a form of Bhavna, depends upon the Subject (Atma). The only difference between this philosophy and ourselves on the point is that according to the Mimamsakas becoming manifest is quality of the object, technically called Vistate and Consciousness (Samvid) is different from it this and it is not free.

The use of the word "by me" (मया) conveys the idea that Knowledge is ~~different~~ dependent upon the Subject. Therefore the two statements "I experienced" and "it was experienced by me" mean the same thing, the difference lies in words only.

Others put the words in a different prose-order as follows: "I had that experience" and "was seen by me" the forms of remembrance are mere analysed forms of the original form of remembrance "I experienced". The word "अपि" is used in the sense of "and".

...held that perception does not shine apart as an object in remembrance, because of its resting on the subject (Ahanta). (we would point out) that there is another type of experience, in which we find a cognition

Cognising as perception as "this" (e.g. I had this experience that perception")

यदि = अगर, अहंभावविश्रान्तिवशात् = पूर्वअनुभवके अहंभाव पर ही स्थितिः के वश से या जैसे कहागया "अहं अन्वभूवम्" आत्मारोहण से।

अनुभवः ..... न भाते = अनुभव ज्ञान स्मृति में पृथग् नहीं भासता है (इदन्ता से)।

इति उच्यते = ऐसा आप ने जो कहा।

or which परामर्शान्तरे classifies the perception as resting the external objects like jar, which are rightly experienced as objects. Why not then make use of that analogy?

परामर्शान्तरे = "अन्वभूवम्" इति परामर्शादन्यः परामर्शः "सा दृग् मे आसीत" इत्येवं रूपः

साक्षादेव ..... = इदन्ता परामर्शम् अनुभवस्य अत्यन्तमयुक्तं ज्ञात्वा पक्षान्तरमाह "यदि वा" इति।

इदंभावैः = वेद्यरूप से, उचित = अनुभूयमान "घट" रूपसे

अनुभवस्य प्रथयत् = प्रथां नयत्

उपलब्धम् = अनुभूतम्, तदनुसारेण = तस्य परामर्शस्य तत्स्यानुवृत्त्या ("सा दृक् मे आसीत्" इति)

अ स्मर्यते यद्दृगासीन्मे सैवमित्यपि भेदतः।
तद्व्याकरणमेवास्या मया दृष्टमिति स्मृतेः ॥६॥

योजना:— "यत् दृग् मे आसीत" इति (एतदेवम् अनुभवोऽसौ मम् अभूदिति) सा एव दृग् (अनुभवो) एवम् भेदतः अपि स्मर्यते, 'मया दृष्टम्' इति अस्या स्मृतेः तद्व्याकरणम् (व्याख्यानम्) एव ॥

Eng:- The particular experience in which one remembers "I had that perception before" and in which the former perception appears apart from remembrance as its object, (यद् दृग् मे आसीत् इति सा एवम् भेदतः अपि स्मर्यते) is only an analysis of the process of remembrance: 'It was seen by me before' (मया दृष्टम् इति अस्या स्मृतेः तद् व्याकरणमेव).

It is the experience of common people that a person remembers that he had the knowledge of the past perception just as (एवं) he remembers it now (on the later occasion). This later knowledge i.e. the knowledge of the later remembrance, is a different exposition (व्याकरणम्) of the past knowledge i.e. the knowledge of past perception, as is denoted by the words (मया दृष्टमिति). This shows that the knowledge of the former perception is one with the knowledge of the later remembrance i.e. they are unified in Self-Consciousness.

लोकस्य = अप्रबुद्धस्य लोकस्य ,

संवेदने = सा दृग् सोऽनुभवः मम आसीत् इति यत् स्मर्यते इत्यन्वयः ॥

'एवम्' इति - "सा मे दृगासीत" इत्येवं रूपम्

संवेदनम् = स्मृति ज्ञानम् ॥

...gnition of the people in general. For they do not think that perception shines apart from remembrance as its object as "I had that experience". Even if we admit that in the case of certain persons, who claim to be great analysists, स: = लोक: , पृथग्भूताम् = संबन्धित्वेन कथनात् षष्ठी-द्योतितभेदभूषिताम्.

the remembrance assumes the form, "I had that experience" our position is not affected. For all that is simply an elaboration of "I ...". It is an elaboration, analysis, similar to that of a word into imaginary parts, such as root, suffix, in order to explain its meaning to others.

वह लोग इस अनुभव ज्ञान को (साद्दश् मे आसीत्) अगर इस परामर्श में षष्ठीभेद भी आया है लेकिन इस ज्ञान को अपने से (शरीर दृष्टी से) भिन्न नही मानते हैं।

दृशं = ज्ञान को , मन्येत = मानता है (न पृथग्भूताम्)

"अहं जानामि" जैसे ज्ञान अपने से भिन्न नही मानता है॥

कोचित् = वक्ष्यमाणद्वाविंशतिभेद भिन्न ज्ञानजात मध्ये एकामपीत्यर्थः न मन्यते, — "अहमनुभवामि" इत्यादिरूपाहं विश्रान्ततैव सेवत्र. संवेदनात् इति भावः॥

अपि → एतद्वासंभवने - अपि शब्देन द्योतितम्

यत् स्मर्यते ...... विवेचकंमन्यस्य = ~~केनचिद्विवेचकत्वाभिमा~~ केनचिद्विवेचकत्वाभिमानयुक्तस्यै इति अर्थः

कस्यचित् = मिथ्याविवेचकत्वाभिमानयुक्तस्य

-x- केनचिद्विवेचकंमन्येन कर्त्रा 'सा मे दृगासीत' इत्येवमपि भेदतः यत् स्मर्यते इति॥

तत् = स्मरणम्.

स्फुटव्यीकरणम् = Exposition in a different way of the same thing. टीका.

पदस्येव = "कुंभकार" इति पदस्येव

यहां - प्रकृति ⟶ "घटं करोमि" ⟶ इस प्रत्ययार्थ - का इस प्रत्यय का अर्थ केवल कहा जाता

काल्पनिकम् — यह षष्ठीभेद कलपना किया हुवा है न कि स्वभाविकै॥

न तु सहजम्, परमार्थतोऽखंडस्य पदस्यैव सोऽर्थः॥

सुनना ← आकरणम् — व्याकरण [illegible] पर = दूसरे पर

प्रतिपादनमात्रम् = दूसरे को केवल ~~समझाने~~ दिखलाने के लिए न तु सम्यग्बोधनम् इत्यर्थः

That analyst also, if he be conscious of the original "I remember" as the basis of the analysed form of it, as stated above; then he also does not cognise perception as an object.

"सोऽपि" = प्रतिपादनमात्र , मूलप्रतीतिम् - "सा मे दृगासीत्" इति प्रतीतेः मूलतया स्थिताम्, अन्यथा अस्य अनुत्थानात् ॥

अहमिति आत्मारोहेण

प्रो पूर्वोक्तक्रमेण = अन्वभूवमहमिति -

(सा दृगासीत् मे) ← अनुभवं पृथग्भूतं न वेद (वेदयते) = फिर अनुभव को स्मृति से भिन्न नहीं समझेगा ॥

पुनः किं वेदयते इत्यत आह " तत् इति

राहोः शिरः" इतिवत् , अत्र राहोः शिरोमात्ररूपत्वात् स्फुरमेव षष्ठीसूचितो भेदः यथा काल्पनिकः तथैतदपीत्यर्थः ॥

अगर कहे "सा दृग्" मूल पर नहीं थी} ← अन्यथा = काल्पनिक भेदानङ्गीकारी.

स घटः = जो पूर्व अनुभूत घट है (संस्कार) में ठहरा हुआ उस की तरह

यह "सा दृक" , प्राक्तने = पूर्व अनुभव में ठहरी हुई.

दृगन्तरम् = अन्यमनुभवम् - अपेक्षणीयं स्यात्

"स" इति विमर्शस्यापेक्षिकत्वादिति भावः

घटस्य = स घट इत्यत्र , दृशो वा = सा दृक् इत्यत्र

पूर्वानुभवविषयापत्ति = फिर पूर्वानुभव पर विषय वाला भाव चढेगा, याने उस को दूसरा ज्ञान विषय करने वाला ...

अन्यथा = जब उस पूर्वानुभव के विषय का अभाव, को ज्ञा- ...

ता दृक इत्येव स्यात = केवल दृक मानें तो (अनुभव) ही रहेगा

ततश्च = उसी कारण से ------ = अगर एक ज्ञान दूसरे से वेद्य हो जाये तो उस को जानने के लिए दूसरा ज्ञान चाहिये ॥

तत्रापि = दृगन्तरेऽपि , तथात्वे = दृगन्तरापेक्षित्वे

Rather he simply assumes separate objective existence of perception as in the case of "the head of Rahu". otherwise

Just as (remembrance) "that jar" refers to something which was the object of former perception, so in the case of "that remembrance" "that knowledge" also there would arise the necessity of another former experience. For by the pronoun "that" it is intended that the jar or the one that has been the object of former experience, otherwise only "experience" (instead of "that experience") would have been used.

But that would mean [illegible] "I experience" [illegible] by [illegible] there also [illegible] the same [illegible] necessarily [illegible] experience

...original undisputed form of Remembrance?
I say "was seen by me"

मौलिकं = पारमार्थिकं , "मया" = प्रतिज्ञानमेव सफलयति
उपलक्षणे चैतत् "अत्र अन्वभूवम्" इत्यादि ॥
अस्यैव हि प्रयोगस्य दर्शनस्यात्मविश्रान्ति प्रतिपादनपरस्य आत्मदर्शनविभागकरणे "सा मे दृगासीत" इति प्रयोग इति भावः ।

दयिता वदननलिनादि विश्रान्त दर्शनम् उक्तम् = यह जैसी जो दर्शन क्रिया है यह तो केवल दृश्य भाव पर ही ठहरी है आत्मारूढ तो नहीं ॥
कर्मणि निष्ठोत्पत्तेः = यह क्रिया कर्म पर ठहरी है
स एव स्ववाचमेव = जो आप ने कहा अभी
न चेतयते = क्या तुम ने महसूस नहीं किया कि तुम क्या कहते हो
स एव = वैय्याकरण इत्यर्थः , न चेतयते = न जानाति
लक्षणया विषयविश्रान्तम् , कुत इत्याह "कर्मणि" इति
निष्ठोत्पत्तेः = क्त प्रत्ययोत्पत्तेः, प्रत्ययस्य हि विश्रान्तिस्थान पर प्रधानपरत्वमेवेति भाव
कर्तृः क्रियाया ...... = करने वाले की जो दर्शन क्रिया है
आप्यं कर्म = जो इष्ट कर्म है
दृष्टिक्रियाया कर्तृनिष्ठत्वेन = यह दृष्टि क्रिया कर्ता पर ही ठहरे
नहि ~~स्वकि इस~~ दयिता वदनादि दर्शनेन तद्वदनादेः कोऽप्यातिशयः, अपि तु द्रष्टुः चैत्रस्यैव, ननु
उदाहरणः- दर्शयते इति – राजा, कर्ता, भृत्यान् स्वात्म स्वयं दर्शयते ते च तं पश्यन्तीत्यर्थः ॥

दृष्टिः = दर्शनक्रिया – भावनात्मिका = भावनारूपा.
"सा धातोः प्रत्ययाद्वापि भाव अवगता सती"
इति तन्मते भावनाया एवार्थत्वात् ॥

But does not this mean that seeing rested on the ... like face of the ... not on the ... cause the past ... participle ... requires ... reference of the action ... were ... possible? The person who says so ... does not himself understand ... he says ... the act of seeing is dependent upon the ... And therefore in "... is shown the ... the act of seeing is said ... ing on the subject.

→ arguments are ... as follows.

केवलं = स्वपक्षस्य विशेषमात्र । (The only difference between this philosophy (Jainism Mimamsas) that of ours is on this point is :- x

प्रकटता दृष्टसाख्या = दर्शनक्रियाफलभूता, दृष्टताख्या प्रकटता, यद्वशेन "दृष्टः" इति ।

Becoming manifest x according to Mimamsa, becoming manifest is a quality of the object technically called "दृष्टता" and

जैमिनीय ... अन्यो = of Mimamsa.

संविद = As we (our Their philosophy) is not free

"पश्यामि" इत्यन्तरे विशेषणविशेष्यभाव व्यवहारः इति भावः

मतलब यह कि जैमिनीय भी जो ज्ञानरूप दृश क्रिया है उस को भावना स्वरूप मानते हैं लेकिन प्रमाता (subject) पर विश्रान्ति सहित ही मानते हैं केवल इतना विशेष है कि प्रकटता जो ... की है वह विषय वह "धरधर्म" ही मानते हैं और लेकिन जो ... है उस को अस्वतन्त्र मानते हैं, इस तरह से वह संवित् हम तो "अन्यत" धर धर्म संवित् ही मानते हैं यानी "अवान्तरम्" निचले दरजे की प्रमेय रूप ॥ (अर्थविश्रान्तित्वेन स्वतन्त्र्यरहिता — प्रमेय-परिसमाप्तौ ॥

प्रमातृविश्रान्तत्वमेव ..... मया इत्युक्तम = "मया" के कहने से सूचित है कि दृश्य क्रिया प्रमाता के अधीन है ॥

~~अर्थेतु भिन्नक्रमत्वेन~~ ...... तेन अत्वम् ... ---- ----

.... न तु अर्थभेदः = Therefore the two statements "I experienced" + "It was experienced by me" mean the same thing, the difference lies in words only

Even the Mimamsa Sutras admit that "seeing" the essential nature of which is knowledge which is a form of Bhavana, depends upon the subject (Pramata). The only difference between this philosophy & themselves on this point is that according to the Mimamsakas becoming manifest is quality of the object, technically called दृष्टता & consciousness (Samvid) is different from this & it is not free.

(8)

... the word "by me" (Mayā) conveys the idea that knowledge is dependent upon the subject. Therefore the two statements 'I experienced' & "It was experienced" अन्ये तु भिन्नक्रमत्वेन योजयन्ति...... इत्येवं = Others put the "by me" words in a different wordorder as follows "I had means the that experience" and "was seen by me", these forms same thing of remembrance are mere analysed forms of the difference original form of remembrance "I experienced" lies in words only

अपि: चार्थे = The word "अपि" is used in the sense of "and" in the Karika (6).

Others put the words in a different wordorder as follows: "I had that experience" & "was seen by me" the forms of remembrance are mere analysed forms of the original form of remembrance "I experienced". The word 'Api' is used in sense of 'and'.

T.K.: अत एव निर्जा:- But even though a thing may be perceived indeterminately, yet so long as there is no determinate perception, there is no particular remembrance of it possible, as in the case of stones and leaves etc seen on the way. Therefore, it has to be thought over whether at the time of determinate knowledge the ~~id~~ indeterminate which shone before, does not shine as "this" or not. To clear this doubt then he says as follows:-

अनुभूतमपि → निर्विकल्पज्ञानेन

सविकल्पज्ञानस्येव परामर्शकत्वात् ←

ननु दृष्टमपि निर्विकल्पेन = अनुभूत अर्थ निर्विकल्प ज्ञान में जब ठहरा हो - (वहां स्मरण का अभाव होता है)

यावत् न परामृष्टं ..... = जब तक परामर्श न हो सविकल्प ज्ञान से

दृष्टमपि ← तावत न स्मर्यते = तब तक उस अर्थ की स्मरण भी नहीं हो सकती

विशेषणरूपेण न स्मर्यते इति योजना॥

मार्गे दृष्टमिव तृणपर्णादि विशेषरूपेण = जैसे तृण और पत्ते आदि रास्ते में देखते हैं

तदिदमेव विचारणीयं = There fore it has to be thought-over whether -x-

समनन्तर भावि विकल्प काले = निर्विकल्प ज्ञानानन्तर भाविनः सविकल्प ज्ञानस्य समये

तद्दर्शनम् = निर्विकल्पनमनुभवनम् -

इदन्तया = इदन्ता रूप से , अवभातपूर्वी न वा, इदन्ता से भासि होता है या नहीं

-x- Whether at the time of determinate knowledge the indeterminate which shone before, does that shine as "this" or not.

All determinate knowledge arises from indeterminate. In self a thing does not shine as determinate as "this" (object), so there can be no particular remembrance of it possible. The opponent wants to lay stress again on the point that the former perception is separate from remembrance and as such it has to be accepted as the object of remembrance. The teacher replies to this objection as follows:-

Page 142 :- [illegible]

The opponent says, if one looks at things indeterminately without taking special notice of anything particular determinately there is no remembrance of any particular thing possible, just as when one looks at trees, plants, grass & leaves on the way while going to some place. So long as there is no determinate perception of any thing i.e. so long as the indeterminate knowledge of a thing does not shine as determinate, 'this' (object) there can be no remembrance of it. The opponent wants to lay stress again on the point that the former perception is separate from remembrance and as such, it has to be accepted as the object of the latter. The teacher replies:-

योजना:- 'अहम् इमं पश्यामि', 'अयं घट:' इति वा अवसा (बोधे:, अध्यवसाय:) या मन्यते, सापि अवसातरि (प्रमातरि) समवेतं (प्रमातृमय मेव) दर्शनम् - निर्विकल्पकम् अनुभवम् (प्रत्यवमृश्यते) ॥.

Whether one takes the form of determinate knowledge (experience) to be as expressed in: "I see this" or "this is the jar" (अहं इमां पश्यामि घटो अयं इति वा, अवसा मन्यते), &c.

it is one with the knowing subject, the self consciousness, (साधि ज्ञवसातृधि-समवेतम दर्शनम्), resting in it as indeterminate knowledge (निर्विकल्प अनुभवम्).

The teacher means whether the knowledge be determinate or indeterminate, it is ultimately indeterminate being unified in the knower. The determinate knowledge of the former perception as a matter of fact, rests on the knowing subject in the form of indeterminate and in the later state (remembrance), it is revived again as determinate knowledge. All cognitions are, therefore, inseparable from the self and are invariably dependent upon it.

या च पश्याम्यहमिमं घटोऽयमिति वाऽवसा।
मन्यते समवेतं साप्यवसातरि दर्शनम् ॥७॥

योजना:- "अहम् इमं पश्यामि", "अयं घटः" इति वा अवसा (बोधेः, अध्यवसायः) या मन्यते, सापि अवसातरि (प्रमातरि) समवेते (प्रमातृमयेव) दर्शनम् — निर्विकल्पकम् अनुभवनम् (प्रत्यवमृश्यते)॥

Eng: Whether one takes the form of determinate Knowledge (experience) – "I see this" or "this is the jar" (अहं इमं पश्यामि घटो अयं इति वा अवसा मन्यते) it is one with the Knowing Subject, the Self Consciousness) resting in it as indeterminate Knowledge (निर्विकल्पकम् अनुभवम्)

दर्शने = निर्विकल्पज्ञानम् .... यादृशे..... सर्वदा (Here the indeterminate cognition as it is in itself (at one time so it must always be).

तत् च = दर्शने — स्वकाले ⇒ निर्विकल्प काले (Now this indeterminate cognition, at the time when it arises is Self-luminous + therefore rightly it should shine as essentially "Aham"

तावत् न कुत्रचित् अङ्गम् = उस समय इस निर्विकल्प ज्ञान पर उपकारकम्. सविकल्प ज्ञान का कोई अंश नहीं है
(Therefore discussion on the determinate knowledge which follows it, is of no help anywhere)

भवतु वा = or it may be so.

विकल्परूप अवसाय भी अहंता गोचर ही है॥

अवसायोऽपि = दर्शनविकल्पांशोऽपि (But the point to be emphasised is that the determinate Knowledge also is self-luminous "अपि" यही दिखलाता है॥

एवंभूतम् = अनन्य प्रकाशः

तत्र समनन्तर .... दर्शितम् ...... अत्र अयं- शब्देन

प्रत्यक्षायमानत्वमुक्तम् ॥ Now the thing which forms the object of determinate knowledge, following close upon indeterminate one, is cognised in two ways (i) through perceptual experience, relating to the present time as, "I see this". Here the pronoun "this" indicates that the activity of indeterminate perception appears to be the object of determinate perception as it were. (ii) This (determinate cognition) may also assume the form, "This is jar" excluding "I", Here the objectivity as it were, of indeterminate perception is indicated by the word "this" – "अयं"

इति "अयम" शब्दस्यापि "इदम" शब्दवत् प्रत्यक्षविषये प्रयोगादिति भाव:

तत्र अन्त्ये विकल्पे ..... कात्तत्र इदन्ता शङ्का =
Here in the last, "this is jar", there is not even so much as a separate reference to indeterminate cognition. Therefore the question of its being considered as "this" (ie the object of another another knowledge) does not arise

ततश्च परिशेष्यात् = Hence it naturally follows

अहन्तया तस्य अत्रास्ति परामर्श: = that here the cognition is apprehended as "I" – "by ahanta".

तदाभावे = अहं परामर्शाभावे , विकल्पस्य = विषय विकल्पस्य

निमीलिताक्षेऽपि = निमीलित नेत्र पुरुषेऽपि,

भावात् - निमीलितनेत्रोऽपि हि विकल्पकरणे समर्थो भवति

स्वयम = तस्य विकल्पस्य स्वयम् कृत्र –

– अर्थस्पर्शे सति , स्फुटतम: = सर्वधर्मग्राहणेनातिस्फुटो यो विषय: तत्र

पर्यवसितः = विश्रान्तः , अध्यवसायः = अर्थात् तस्य निमीलिताक्षस्य कथं भवेत्,

For if it be not admitted to be Apprehended as "I" determinate cognition being possible even in a person who closes his eyes, (soon after the Contact with the object) how could the mental reaction which rests on clearly manifest object, which is being directly perceived, be possible.

आयेतु = अहं पश्यामि इत्यत्र, परापष्टुम् = पश्यामि

अस्मदर्थान्तर्भूतः = प्रत्ययार्थे भूते अस्मदर्थे त्रुटितम्,

अत एव अहंभावास्पदम् = अहंभावविषयीभूतम्, अत एव

अवसातरि = प्रमातरि , विश्रान्तम् = विश्रान्तं गतम्, अत एव

अतः कारणात् स्वप्रकाममेव परामृष्टुम् , एवं सविकल्पज्ञानमपि,

न बोधस्य = ज्ञानभवस्य , बोधान्तरबोध्यताम् = दूसरे किसी बोध से जाना नहीं जाता है॥ (सविकल्प ज्ञान से)

Thus the determinate knowledge also does not show that one cognition can be known by another.

अवसायः ---- = means determinate knowledge.

समवेतम = means not separate.

अवसातरि = --- अहन्तास्पदे = means in the free introvert basis of self-consciousness which is essentially self-luminous.

दर्शनम् = means indeterminate experience.

उपलक्षणं ------- अयमेव न्यायः = This implies determinate knowledge & remembrance also; because this is the only right thing that can be said in regard to the view that one knowledge is the object of another.

विकल्पयाम्यहं ...... अवभासात् = For in all forms of cognitions, "I determinately know", "I remember", "Known by me", "remembered by me", the cognition is found invariably dependent upon the Self, because they rest in the latter.

अत एव ..... ज्ञानस्मृत्यपोहनशक्तिमान्,
Thus it has been proved that Self has the powers of perception, remembrance, & differentiation.

एवमियता: ..... आह :-
The following is the summary statement of the conclusion from what has been said above:-

तन्मया दृश्यते दृष्टोऽयं स इत्यामृशत्यपि ।
ग्राह्यग्राहकताभिन्नावर्थौ भातः प्रमातरि ॥८॥

योजना :-
'मया दृश्यते', "मया दृष्टः" "अयं", "स" इति तत्- ग्राह्य-ग्राहकताभिन्नौ अर्थौ (एक) प्रमातरि भातः (एक प्रमातृ-लीनौ एव अनुभाव्य - अनुभावकौ मायाकृतविच्छिन्नौ-अवभासौ अपि प्रकाशते).

Eng:- The perceiver (subject) experiences various cognitions in orders denoted by the expressions: "is seen by me", (or "I see") "was seen by me (or "I saw"), 'this' and "that". They fall into two categories as knowers and known. Both of them shine in the subject, in their essential nature.

Perception अनुभवः 2 forms
(1) Stress on Subject
(2) Stress on object

Remembrance: Has 2 experiences.
सः अहं
(1) (2)

Draṣṭā (this) — सः इति
अहं इति

As every perception is of 2 forms
So Remembrance falls into
4 forms according
Perception.

Recognition is unification of
2 experiences (1) remembrance +
(2) perception.
So Recognition falls into
8 categories according to 4
forms of Remembrance.

Then these 8 Categories also
get double as and when the
former and later experience
Predominate – so it has 16
forms.

Adding up 2 forms of perception, 4
forms of remembrance + 16 forms of
recognition total is 22 forms of cognition.

तन्मयेति यदेतत्पूर्वमुक्तं तस्माद्धेतोर यमत्र तात्पर्यार्थः;
यत् विशुद्धसंविद्रूपे प्रमातरि ग्राह्यग्राहकरूपतया :-
परस्परापेक्षतया भिन्नौ वेधावधौ भासेते इति, कीदृशी?
मया दृश्यते मया दृष्ट इत्यानुभवस्मरणामर्शोनोपलक्षिते
अयमिति स इति च दर्शनभागानादरणेन अनुभूयमानार्थ-
भाग प्रधानेन आमर्शनेन उपलक्ष्यते, अपिश्चार्थे अपि-
शब्दो भिन्नक्रमः; भिन्नावपि एकत्र आभासेते इति॥

आनुशाति = अनुभवति, स्मरति चेति

तत = This word is used in the sense of "therefore", and indicates that what has been said before has to be as the reason (for the following conclusion.

तस्मादर्थे .... इह सूचयति = स्वयमुक्तम् = It has been said before that perception does not shine as separate from remembrance (in remembrance) as does the object and that the power of remembrance belongs to the Lord. The following therefore is a settled fact:-.

अनुभवस्य = पूर्वानुभवस्य, अर्थस्येव = पूर्वार्थवत्

स्मरणात न भेदेन = न स्मृतिविषयतंया

तत = तस्मात्, परिनिष्ठितं = स्थितिं गत:, तत्त्वम् = परमार्थ:

क्रोडीकरोति = स्वान्त: करोति, Remembrance includes the perception (अनुभवं) within itself.

अनुभवश्च द्विधा = The perception however has two forms, because of the difference in intellectual reaction.

कदाचित् = तत्र प्रथमं भेदं ~~कथमं कथम~~ कथयति-

स्वात्मपरामर्शपूर्वकम् = अनुभवरूपस्य स्वस्य य: परामर्श: - "दृश्यते" इत्यादिरूप: स: पूर्वं यत्र तत्

अनुभाव्यम् = अनुभवविषयीभूत घटादिकम्,

अभिसंधि प्रधानतो = स्वस्यात्मनिविश्रान्तिरूपमनुसन्धानम तस्य प्राधान्यम्, जैसे "मया दृश्यते".

(1) Sometimes perception of the object is preceded by self-consciousness. In this case there is predominance of self consciousness or will as in "Seen by me".

कदाचित् = और किसी समय, अनुभवनीयमेव = अनुभव-
विषयं घटादिकमेव, न तु
अस्मद् शब्द वाच्यं वस्त्वपि,

सहसा = इच्छा निर्विवेकेत्यर्थः । अकस्मादिति यावत्, नहि
च तत्र हि स्फुटं संभ्रमेण वस्तुमात्र परामर्श एव
भवति,

(ii) At other times he primarily perceives the object. In this case there is no will, but the object forcibly presents itself to the Consciousness all of a sudden, or the subject is swayed by the idea of causal efficiency (of object) as in this case of "this", in this case also there is determinate self-consciousness, otherwise object will not shine.

अर्थक्रियां प्रति = तेन वस्तुना संपादनीयायामर्थक्रियायाम्

आग्रहविशेषः = अथं अर्थित्वादिविषये तत्रापि
अतिकांक्षणीयत्वेन वस्तुन एव प्राधान्यात्
तत्परामर्श एव भवति

किम् रूपोऽसौ परामर्श इत्यत आह "अयम्" इति

तत्रापि = "अयम्" इति परामर्शोऽपि, अतिसूक्ष्मत्वेन-
असंचेत्यमान परामर्श अस्त्येव.

अन्यथा --- = विषय प्रकाशासंभवात् -

प्रत्येकम् = प्रत्यनुभवम्, द्वयपरामर्शमयी = Accordingly the forms of perception are two, so are those of remembrance also.

स्मरणभेदाः चत्वारः = Thus with the subdivision of each form of remembrance (according to the two forms of perception the remembrance is of 4 kinds.

यथा दृश्यते इत्यनुभवे "दृष्टम्" इति रूपः एकः,

अत्रैव "सः" इत्येवं रूपो द्वितीयः । "अयम्" इत्यनुभवे "दृष्टः" इत्येवं-रूपस्तृतीयः, अत्रैव "सः" इत्येवं रूपश्चतुर्थः

(यह 6 भेद बन गये)

द्वौ अनुभवभेदौ = दो प्रकार के अनुभव में

अनुसंधानरूपे प्रत्यभिज्ञानम् = By the unification of past & present experience, Recognition which means

एतत् उभय मेलनात्मकम् अत्रैवान्तरभूतम् = is included in the above mentioned 6 forms of Knowledge (अनुभव).

प्रतिभिज्ञाने च

तत् च = अनुसंधानम् (स्मृतानुभूत मेलनात्मकेन प्रतिभिज्ञानेन)

एतेषाम् = अनुभवयो स्मृतीनाञ्च भेदात् अष्टप्रकारं अष्टत्वम् - भवति अनुभवभेदद्वयेन सह स्मृतिभेद चतुष्कस्याऽनुसंधाने अष्टधाभाव:

But because of different forms of perception and remembrance, the Recognition (प्रत्यभिज्ञा) has 8 forms. These being subdivided into 2 each according as the past or present experiences predominate, it has sixteen forms. Thus there are 22 forms of cognitions

तेषु = द्वाविंशति भेदेषु च, ग्राह्यं = अनुभाव्य स्मर्यमाणप्रत्यभिज्ञेयतया स्थितो विषयः

तत् = संवेदनद्वाविंशतिकम्, अर्थत्वासंभवात् = विषयत्वासंभवात्,

In these 22 cognitions the object of cognition is not outside the light of the subject. For, otherwise it would not be manifest.

तदैव = प्रकाशात् प्रकाशे सति, तदेव =

पृथग्भूतं = = अत्र पृथग्भूतं च भवति

(But this object also is to be admitted as separate from light. For, otherwise how can it be called the object?)∴

तदैव, तदेव पृथग्भूतं .... कथङ्कारं पृथग्भावो भवेत॥

∴ But how can one & the same thing, at one & the same time be said to be separated from the "light" and yet be in the "light"? Therefore naturally there has to be supposed something, the essential characteristic of which is limited light, as the subject, because of which this mass of (real) objects, being separate from the "limited light" may be separate from one another also.
For if they be non-different from the "True light" how can the mutual difference among them be possible? Though this assumed (separate) "light" is a part of the objective & different from the real subject, yet, even when it is still in the condition of an object, it is conceived as "I" as if it were free from all limitations - It shall be called Maya pramata "in body, in mind" and it is spoken of as experiencer.

नूनम् = निश्चयेन, कल्पितः = देहादिभावेन

प्रकाशः = तदवच्छिन्नः प्रकाशांशः, स आत्मा यस्य तादृशः,

अर्थः = प्रमेयतया स्थितः, शुद्ध प्रकाशे प्रति वेद्यत्वात्॥

यतः = यस्मात् कारणात्, अस्थिराद्भिः अथम् = अनुभूयमानः
ननु सोऽर्थः कोऽस्तीत्यत आह "सोऽयम्" इति
वेद्यैकदेश एव = वेद्यराशिमध्ये एकरूपत्वात् ततभाग एव,
न तु वेदकरूपः
तथा विच्छिन्न एव = घटादिवत्, परम प्रकाशात् पृथग्भूत एव
"अहमिति परामर्शेन"
कीदृशेन "अहम" इति परामर्शेन? इति संबन्धः
विच्छेदशून्यो यः प्रकाशः तत्रोचितेन,
सममेव = न तु क्रमेण, ग्राह्यग्राहकयोर्भिन्नकालत्वेन संबन्धो
न स्यादिति भावः॥
निर्मल मुकरस्थानीय = प्रतिबिंबसहिष्णुत्वेन निर्मलदर्पण
सदृशे,
युगलकम् = ग्राह्यग्राहकद्वयम्, तदेव = भासनमेव

Thus his simultaneous manifestation of the pair of perceiver and percieved in His mirror like - Self, as not altogether different from his essential Self-luminous nature, Constitutes His being as the doer of the act of perception and that of remembrance. This is the essential feature of Lord's power of perception & of Remembrance. This is the implied meaning & the following is the literal meaning:—

"मया दृश्य●" "Seen by me" "अयम्" — "This"

प्रकाशरूपः प्रमाता इति संबन्धः, येन = येनामर्शः

तत् = तस्मात् लक्षणात् , लक्ष्यते = ज्ञायते, बोध्यते

→ ग्राह्यरूपेण ग्राहकरूपेण ...... प्रकाशेते ॥

(From such determinate cognitions it is evident that phenomena such as 'garden' and "body" etc & when unified as object and subject respectively, shine in pure Self-luminous Subject

एवं दृष्टः इति स .... यतोऽसौ स्मरति

इति .... लक्ष्यते = The same is made evident from the determinate cognitions such as "seen" & "this" which the individual Self-luminous Subject has and because of this he is said to be remember.
(interlinear above "Self-luminous": सः; above "luminous": स्वयं)

अनुभवस्योपजीवित्वे .... उन्मीलनं कृतम् =

Here the power of perception also is discussed by the way, in order to support the view, which has been already expressed, that remembrance depends upon perception (अनुभवः).

लक्षणे शत्रादेशः = "अभ्युद्धाति" इत्यत्र लक्षणहेत्वोः क्रियायाः इति सूत्रेण,

The substitution of Personal termination by Present participial affix implies that the word, to which it is added, stands for characteristic.

अपि - शब्दश्चार्थे = The word "अपि" means 'च' i.e "and"

अर्थ- शब्दो विच्छिन्नवेद्यवाची = The word "अर्थः" Stands for what has been objectively manifested as separate from the universal Self-luminous Principle.

ग्राहको ...... अशुद्धप्रकाशस्वभाव इति = The word "Grahaka" means 'limited subject' who belongs to the sphere of Maya & therefore is of impure luminosity.

Note. ननु "ज्ञानस्मृत्यपोहनशक्तिमान्" इत्यत्र प्रथमोद्दिष्टत्वेन स्मृतिप्राणप्रदत्वेन च ज्येष्ठत्वादस्या एव प्रथमं समर्थनं किन्न कृतमिति चेत, सत्यम्, किन्तु यतः स्मृतिरेव-अनुसंधानप्राणत्वेनाभीष्टस्यानुसंधातृरूपस्यात्मतत्त्वस्य साधनी, ज्ञानशक्तिस्तु तद्द्वारेणेत्य युक्तत्वेपि शिष्यसमाश्वासनार्थं प्रथमं स्मृतेरेव समर्थनं कृतम् ॥

पञ्चममाह्निकं

महागुहान्तर्निमग्नभावजातप्रकाशकः ।
ज्ञानशक्तिप्रदीपेन यः सदा स्तुमः शिवम् ॥

We bow to that Śiva, who always illumines by his power of knowledge, the lamp, the multiplicity of objects which lie merged within Himself, the great Cave.

In pratyabhigña, Jñāna-Śakti (the power of knowledge) means the faculty of cognition, conscious activity and the light of Self (Prakāsha). The power of perception (अनुभवः) is a form of power of knowledge (ज्ञानशक्तिरूपः), on which depends the power of remembrance (स्मरणशक्ति).

In this Ahnika, the teacher lays down the doctrine that all the objects directly perceptible to the perceiving subjects (pramātā) exist in their real nature within the Self (Atman) and are projected outwards as manifestations (आभासः). ज्ञानशक्ति functions in making objects manifest externally in the form of their perceptions, which in reality, indwell in Self-Consciousness. By virtue of this power, the Self takes out for separate manifestations only certain things from the unlimited mass which lies merged in it (स्वरूपात् उन्मग्नम् आभासयति), that is to say, it isolates some objects and manifests them externally, emerged, as it is were, from the ocean of light (प्रकाशः) of Consciousness.

एवं = इस तरह, तावत् = यहां तक, स्मृतिशक्ति ···· प्रतिपादितम् = स्मृति का स्वरुप सिद्ध किया है।

अधुना ······· निर्णेयं वितन्यं = अब विस्तार पूर्वक ज्ञानशक्ति जिस पर स्मृति शक्ति निर्भर है उस का निर्णय करेंगे।।

तत्राद्येन = पहिले श्लोक से, वस्तुनि = वस्तु पर, ज्ञानशक्ति के स्वरुप पर,

प्रति प्रतिज्ञां करोति = प्रतिज्ञास्वरुपमेव दर्शयति।

एवंभूता ज्ञान शक्ति इति = कि ज्ञानशक्तिः ऐसी होती है। हेतुः इसी को बनाया,

विज्ञानवादिभिः = बौद्धैः, उपगता = अङ्गीकृता, या वासना-याभाव संस्कारः

तस्या दूषणेन, As a prima facie view that the existence of external objects has been firmly established by refutation of "residual trace" as admitted by the "Bodha", in the next verse he shows that there is no harm even if it be not admitted.

तदनभ्युपगमेऽपि = पदार्थानभ्युगमेऽपि, न उपरुध्यते = दूर कुछ नहीं किया जासकता, सही कुछ नहीं कर सकते।

अर्थत्वम = अर्थ स्वरुप, essential nature of object.

बाह्यार्थसद्भावे ······ प्रमाणत्वेन = Refutes the view that the existence of external object is proved by direct perception

अनुमीयतामपि ···· निरास्यति = ···· by inference also.

चिदात्मनि ····· परामर्शात्मना प्रकटयति = that the objects surely have their existence as mere ideas in Self-luminous universal Self.

प्रत्यवमर्श एव जीवितम् = परामर्श एव, - that the Self-consciousness is the very life of Self luminosity which constitutes the essential nature of the subject.

अनुभवागमन्याय ...... अभिधत्ते = अनुभवस्यागमस्य च न्यायस्य स्वरूप निरूपणाच्च ताभिः

He proves on the basis of experience, Scriptural authority, logic & the examination of Self consciousness being the very life of Self luminosity.

ज्ञानपरामर्शी एव ज्ञेयं ...... प्रधानत्वे न्यायं =

He asserts that "free conscious will" Self manifests that which is purely an object and that which, though an object, yet retains the essential nature of the Subject.

प्रकाशैकरूपत्वे ...... भिन्नम् = That the difference of knowledge and knower presupposes that the light of Consciousness (prakāsha) is their essential nature.

ततो ज्ञातरि इव ...... प्राणितम् = That as in the case of knower so in that of knowledge also, which is indeterminate & determinate type, "free Conscious will" is the very life.

ज्ञातृज्ञानस्य ...... उपसंहार दिशा ... समर्थयते =

He supports the distinction between the knower & the knowledge, which was adversely criticised in the course of the statement of prima facie view.

Karika no 1.

-x- वर्तमानावभासानां ....

The external manifestation of the objects, which are directly perceptible (as separate from the perceiver) can only be possible on the ground that they exist within the Self.

अत्र चायमभिप्रायः। परमार्थतः स्वरूपतया स्थितेषु स्वावयवभूतेषु भावेष्वेवमिति ग्रहणयोग्येषु मायावशेन स्वतः भेदेन यदिदम् इति भासते तत्तथैवावयवतया स्थितानामेव सतो भवति, न ततः च्युतानाम्, यथा मृन्मयस्य घटस्य मृन्मयत्वेन स्थितस्यैव घटतया ग्रहणम्। नहि मृदो निर्गतो घटः किमपि भवति, मृत्सत्तयैव सत्तायुक्तत्वात्, इति तदन्तःस्थितत्वे तदभिन्नतामात्रमेव न तु तदन्तराधेयत्वेनावस्थानं मृद्भावेन हि स्थितो घटः मृदन्तस्थ उच्यते, न तु तदाधारत्वेन स्थितः, तद्बहिःस्थितत्वे तु ततो भिन्नत्व एव, मृदो भिन्नो जलतरङ्गो मृदो बाह्य इत्युच्यते। अतश्च चिदन्तःस्थितस्य भावराशेः चिन्मयत्वमेव तदन्तःस्थितत्वम् न तु स्वप्रधानतया तत्रावस्थानम्, ततो बहिःस्थत्वे च मायावशोद्वेद्यतया ततो भेदेन भासनम्, न तु ततो निर्गत्य कुत्रापि देशावस्थानम् इति तद्बहिरवस्थानं मया कार्यमेव .....

BhI, 197

अनुभव एव = निर्विकल्पज्ञानमेव , तत्र = अनुभवे,
तेष्वपि = स्मरणविकल्पादिष्वपि , तथैव = भेदेनैव,
नो चेत् = अनुभवेऽर्थाः यदि भेदेन न भासन्ते
अन्यथा = . तदा तेष्वपि अभेदेनैवावभास उचित इत्यर्थः
तत् = तस्मात्

There is no doubt about it that indeterminate knowledge is the very life of remembrance and determinate knowledge etc. Now, if the objects shine separately, i.e. as separate or different from Samvid, in indeterminate experience, then the same should be the case in remembrance & determinate knowledge also. But if otherwise, then in the latter also they should not shine separately. Therefore, the power of perception, which is a form of power of knowledge, should be discussed :-

The shining of objects, - which is directly, clearly, cognised as "this", as separate from the individual subject, being of their having been separated from the individual subject beginning with Shunya and ending with the body, which are creations of Maya - is logically possible only if they be admitted →

वर्तमानावभासानां भावानामवभासनम् ।
अन्तःस्थितवतामेव घटते बहिरात्मना ॥ १ ॥

योजना :- वर्तमानावभासानां भावानाम् (अवभासनम्) अन्तःस्थितवताम् बहिरात्मना अवभासनम् एव घटते ॥

वर्तमानत्वेन = विशिष्टदेशकालाभासतया स्फुटमेव पृथग्भावेन-भेदेन
अवभासनम् = Shining of objects, which are directly & clearly cognised
इदमित्येवमाकारं = "as this", "like this"
येषा तेषाम् = विगृहीतानां , सम्यक् स्फुटीभवति ← बहिरात्मना
मायीया : = भेदप्राणत्वेन मायाकार्याः शून्यादयः शरीरान्ताः यः
प्रमातारः , न तु परप्रमातृ , यः पृथग्भावः = तैरेव
कल्पितः स्वस्मात् भेदः तेन

... to lie within the true Subject, which is eternally pure Self-knowing, i.e. if they still retain their [illegible] identity with the universal Subject. Hence it follows that the supreme [illegible] power of Knowledge wrought in manifesting the objects, which still retain its identity with the universal Subject as separate from the limited Subject.

ततो = हेतोः , अवभासनम् = अवच्छिन्नतया

तत् = वहअवभासनम् – is logically possible only.

तेन सह = शुद्धचिन्मयेन परमार्थप्रमात्रा सह,

ऐकात्म्यम् = अभेदम्

The following are the reasons in support of the above view which has been asserted to be based on reasons.

प्रागिवार्थोऽप्रकाशः स्यात्प्रकाशात्मतया विना।
न च प्रकाशो भिन्नः स्यादात्मार्थस्य प्रकाशता ॥२॥

योजनाः– प्रकाशात्मतया विना (प्रमातृसंज्ञा–प्रकाशस्वरूपतां विना) अर्थः प्राग् इव (अग्रहणकाले इव) अप्रकाशः स्यात् (ग्रहणकालेऽपि) (स्वात्म) प्रकाशः (अर्थ–स्वरूपाद्) भिन्नो न च स्यात्; (अतः) (आत्मनः) प्रकाशता अर्थस्य आत्मा (भवति).

अयमत्र संक्षिप्तार्थः —— प्रकाशात्मतया विना – प्रकाशमानतारूप, शुद्धप्रकाशाख्य निजस्वरूपासादनद्वारागत शुद्धप्रकाशरूपतां विना, अर्थः प्रागिव – अग्रहणकाले इव ग्रहणकालेऽपि अप्रकाशः स्यात्, प्रकाशते च असौ ज्ञायते प्रकाशान्तः स्थितस्यैव भवस्य बहिर्–इदन्तया भासनमस्तीति भावः, ननु प्रकाशविषयतयैव अस्य भाने भवतु किं तद्रूपता–कल्पनायासेन इत्यत आह "न च" इति। प्रकाशः भिन्नः न च स्यात्, तथा च अस्य ग्रसंवन्धित्वमेवायुक्तं भिन्नयोः सम्बन्धायोगादिति भावः। अतः प्रकाशोऽर्थस्यात्मा – अलौकिके रूपे स्वरूपे भवति ॥

Bh. I, 203

ज्ञानके उदय न होने पर – अर्थो → नीलादिः , तस्य = तस्य नीलादिः यदि प्रकाशमानता,

नीलादिरूपतैव = नीलादिस्वभावतैव,

ग्रहणसमये–स्थितं 'प्रकाशान्तः' अर्थेवंरूपं प्रकाशकत्वं भवति

Karika 2.

प्रागिवार्थोऽप्रकाशः ....

If the object were lacking the light of the Subject, it would remain unmanifest, even as it was before (प्रागिव).
The light of the Subject cannot be different from the object (न च प्रकाशो भिन्नः स्यात्)
The light of the Subject is therefore, the very essence of a thing (प्रकाशः अर्थस्यात्मा)

न पुनः स अपरा काचित् = नीलादिरूपताया अन्या
सा = प्रकाशमानता , अर्थशरीरोत्तीर्णा = अर्थस्वरूपात् उत्तीर्णा , –
– प्रकाशात्मता – प्रकाशरूपता (शुद्धप्रकाशरूपता) न भवति
तर्हि – तदा , तत् = नीलादि वस्तु ,
यथा सर्वान् अपि = सर्वेषु प्रमातृषु , संभावनया = कल्पनया
नीलमेव लौकिकैः भण्यते ,

If luminosity of an object, such as blue etc can be identical with it & not different from and transcending it, then the object should be manifest to all or to none or in reality, it should be blue only in itself.

परस्य परनिष्ठत्वानुपपत्ते = अन्यलग्नतायोगात् ,
In the two independent things, one cannot be logically spoken of as resting on the other.

स्वात्मनि वा न नीले .... व्यवस्थानायोगात् = or it may not be either blue or not-blue in itself, for without the help of "light" (thought) no possible statement about any thing is possible.

तथा = ज्ञानोदयेऽपि .... अन्धता जगतः –

(अयमभावः = ग्रहणसमये भावस्य मायया भावत्वेन भासिते निजं सहज शुद्धप्रकाशाख्ये स्वरूपमेव प्रमातारं प्रति स्फुटीभवति, यतः तदा प्रमाता तद्वस्तु प्रति दिदृक्षासमये व्यापको भवति)

अथ = अत्र क्षणिकवादी प्रश्नयति,
इन्द्रियालोकादि क्षणवर्गात् = क्षणान्तर सहकृतादुपादानाद् घटक्षणात्,
असौ = नीलार्थः ,

नीलक्षणो = प्रकाशमान घटरूपः।
विशिष्ट एव जातः = ग्रहणयोग्यतारूप विशेष युक्तः
स एव प्रसङ्गः = [But how can you say, says the
[Buddist, that the object would remain the
same (devoid of light) even at the rise of
knowledge, as it was before, because] at
the time of rise of knowledge, the momentary
object, — which has become luminous, be-
cause of its association with other momentary
existences, namely those of sense, and
physical light etc — is distinct from the
previous one. But in this case also, the
(if we admit Budhist theory to be correct)
the same difficulty i.e. becoming manifest
to all or to none will follow.

प्रकटतावादेऽपि अयमेव दोषः = The same is the
objection against the prakatā vāda (of
Kumarila according to which, knowlege
is an action, which is to be inferred from
its result and the result is nothing else than
that which is known as manifestedness,
which is the quality of object.

प्रमाता तदानीम = ग्रहणसमर्थ

सर्वथा .... बीजमिव अङ्कुरस्य = बीजादुत्पन्नः अङ्कुरः
अङ्कुर भावगतः सन् सर्वदा बीजापेक्षा युक्तः न भवति,
तथैवात्मनो लब्धसत्ताकः अर्थ शरीर विश्रान्ताः प्रकाशः
भिन्नत्वेन आत्मानं न अपेक्षते॥ अर्थ शरीर विश्रान्तस्य
प्रकाशस्य प्रमातृ प्रकाशः कारणमिति चेन्न, अर्थ विश्रान्तस्य
यदि प्रकाशत्वं तर्हि किमर्थं प्रकाशम अपेक्ष्यते अङ्कुरस्यांकुरात्मतो
न जीव बीजापेक्षा उत्पत्तौ तु बीजापेक्षैवाङ्कुरस्य॥

न च अङ्कुरो बीजापेक्षोऽकुरात्मा .... ज्ञानोदयेऽपि स्यात् ॥ = →

न च अंकुरः = बीजादुत्पन्नः क अङ्कुरः, अङ्कुरात्मना = अङ्कुरभावं गतः सन्॥
बीजापेक्षः = सर्वदा बीजापेक्षायुक्तः न भवति
स्वकीयकरणे तदपेक्षारहितत्वात्। तथैवात्मनो लब्धसत्ताक अर्थ शरीर विश्रान्तः प्रकाशः भिन्नत्वेन आत्मानं नापेक्षते इत्यर्थः ॥

It cannot be said that the perceiver whose senses etc are responsible for bringing about the manifestedness of Jar, is the cause of manifestation of the object, exactly as the seed is that of sprout (and, therefore, it will shine in relation with him alone) for, the being of sprout as such does not depend upon the seed (after it has been caused).

ततो यदि ...... There-fore if the object be not essentially of the nature of light, it would be as non-manifest at time of rise of knowledge as it was before.

ननु ..... स्यात् =

अर्थप्रकाशरूपमेव = अर्थविषय प्रकाशस्वरूपमेव, न तु नीलवत् विशेषणतया अर्थशरीरविश्रान्तम् ।

तत् = ततः कारणात्, ज्ञानस्योदयानुदयोरर्थस्य = नीलाद्यर्थस्य तुल्यता स्यात् ॥

But how can you so say that the object would the same both before and after the rise of knowledge, because the knowledge itself is of the nature of the light of the object?

स्यात् सतत .... कथं स्यात् = This new would have been accepted if it had the support of reason. But how can the knowledge, which is different from the object, be connected with the latter?

यदि तावत् अर्थः प्रकाशते ..... उक्तं दूषणम् ॥.
If the distinctive feature of knowledge be the shining of the object (in it), the identity of the object and the knowledge would follow, because knowledge (thought) is said to be the essential nature of object, the And if the thought (knowledge) be the essential nature of the object, then thought being the very life of the object, the aforesaid objection will stand. * But if the essential nature of knowledge be said to be that it makes the object manifest, then also the meaning be "it makes the object shine" the same objection will arise.

* अथ अर्थं ...... सम्बन्धः (

कृतप्रतानश्च ...... अन्वेष्यः = I have discussed the meaning of the root + causal affix while refuting dualism. Therefore for information on this point, that portion should be reffered to.

तस्मात ...... नास्ति = Hence it is impossible statement that the separate light is connected with the object.

अर्थस्य .... प्रकाशाभिन्नत्वम् इति = From the above discussion, therefore, it follows that the essential nature of the object is light & that it is non-different from the "Light" (Prakasha).

प्रकाशश्च यदि घटेऽन्यः .... अयोगः तद्द्वयोः .....
स्वात्मात्रपर्यवसानात् = If this light is be different in the case of each different object, their unification will not be possible, because both of them will be would be self confined.

इति वितत्य .... इत्यत्र = This point has been already discussed in the Sloka: " तद्र्यत.....'"

तस्मात .... इति = Therefore, "Light is only one" The same has been shown by repitition " The light cannot be different from the object".

भिन्ने = स्वात्ममात्र पर्यवसाने
अभिन्ने = नीलाद्या (व्यतिरिक्तस्य ? = अर्थाद्भिन्नस्य)
कारशून्ये ॥

तत् = तस्मात् भिन्ने प्रकाशे चाभिन्ने संकरो विषयस्य तत् ।
च = जडस्य स्वात्मनि न काचित्सिद्धि-रित्यर्थः ॥ प्रकाशात्मा प्रकाश्योऽर्थो नाप्रकाशश्च सिद्ध्यति ॥३॥

योजना :- (आत्म-) प्रकाशे (स्वविषयाद्) भिन्ने च अभिन्ने चे, तत् विषयस्य (विषयाणाम्) सङ्करः (सङ्कीर्णता) स्यात् प्रकाश्योऽर्थो प्रकाशात्मा, अप्रकाशश्च (प्रकाश रहितो विषयः) न सिद्ध्यति, तस्मादर्थसिद्धः प्रकाशात्मतया भवति,

Eng: If the light (of thought) be different from the object and homogeneous in itself, then confusion of one object with another would follow. Therefore the object, that is made manifest, is not different from light. For what is not light cannot be said to exist.

यदि = जब अर्थ के साथ प्रकाश के साथ कोई संबन्ध न हो तब:-

भिन्न एव — अथात अन्य एव = अर्थात भिन्नः सन् बोधमात्ररूपो यः प्रकाशः सोऽर्थानां न कश्चिद्भिन्नत्वेन परस्य परनिष्ठत्वायोगात् ॥
ज्ञानात्मा = ज्ञानरूपः
भिन्नोऽर्थतः = यह प्रकाश फिर अर्थ से भिन्न होने पर
स्वात्मनि = निजस्वरूपे , तस्य = इस प्रकाश को
प्रकाशमात्ररूपत्वात् अभेद एव = बोधमात्र स्वरूप केवल होने पर फिर यह अभेद रूप ही है (Homogeneous).

If the light of Consciousness be something other than the object and therefore different from it, then in itself, being pure light of Consciousness, it is one (has no variety). That is

To

Major R K Raina (Retd)
House No 45
Karan Nagar
Srinagar
Kashmir J&K

भिन्ने प्रकाशो चाभिन्ने → अयं भावः, भिन्ने इति
अर्थात्- प्रकाश इति बोधमात्रपरमार्थे, अभिन्न इति
स्वात्मनि, भिन्नेऽपि सर्वपदार्थानुप्रवेशात्प्रकाश
इत्येतावन्मात्रतात्त्विकमभिन्नमेव तत्त्वमवशिष्यत
इति भिन्नेऽपि विषयसंकरः, अत एव च
अभिन्नेऽपि संपन्ने स एव दोषः, ततश्च विषय-
व्यवस्थापि न सिद्ध्येत्। स च अवश्यं समर्थनीया,
तदेतत्समर्थयति - प्रकाश्योऽर्थ इति,
अयमाशयः - न भावस्य प्रकाश्यता नाम
धर्मः अपि तु अर्थः प्रकाशते स्वे वपुरेवास्य
प्रकाशः तदेवाह प्रकाशात्मा, ननु चात्र

दोषबाहुल्यादले विषयसंकीर्णतापादकेन
प्रबोधिन इत्यत आह नाप्रकाश इति ॥

If the light of the Subject be different from the object (भिन्नप्रकाश) and remains as one in itself (अभिन्न च), i.e. if it remains without variety or distinction in respect of different object, it would result then, in confusion of one object with another. Therefore, the object, that is made manifest, has the light of the Subject as its essential nature (प्रकाश्योऽर्थो प्रकाशात्मा). For, what is not light, i.e. what is not known by the Perceiver cannot be said to exist (अप्रकाश एव न सिद्ध्यति)

(Kaw).

as follows:-

भेदवादत्यागापत्ते = वैशेषिका हि भेदनिष्ठा एव, ज्ञानार्थयोश्च तैरेकस्वरूपत्वेऽङ्गीकृते स्वाभीष्टस्य भेदवादस्य तेषां त्याग एव स्यात् ॥

If in the statements "the knowledge of nila" & "the knowledge of pita" the aspects 'nila' & 'pita' are to be considered to be the essential aspects of knowledge, and consequently it would mean the abondonement of the theory of difference.

अथ विषयः = ज्ञानस्य, नीलांशः पीतांशः ज्ञानस्य चेद् विषयः भवति,

तदेवेदम् = विषयत्वमेव

But if they be represented to be objects, let us see how that can be possible.

कथं संगच्छताम् = युक्तं भवेत

इह ~~स्वन~~ प्रकाशनलात् .... अभ्युपगन्तव्यः = अवश्यमङ्गीकर्तव्यः अन्यथा तस्यासिद्धेः ॥

The difference between nila and pita is to known through the light (of consciousness),

येनैव .... कथं संगच्छताम् = But how that very light through which nila is known only as nila and pita ~~is to be known~~ also can be known only as such, (the light of consciousness being the same in both the cases).

नीलेन जनितः .... यत् उच्यते। = It cannot be said that the difference is due to the fact that one is caused by blue and the other by ~~blue~~ yellow or it forms one whole with blue or yellow.

तेन वा सह एकसामग्रीकः = नीलेन सहैकसामग्रीयुक्तः
नीलप्रकाशो भवति, एवं पीतेन सहैवेति
स एव विचार्यः = नीलपीतभेदयोर्भेद एव.
अथ = सौत्रान्तिकमते, असौ = प्रकाश एव, नीलाकारो
भवति, तत एव नीलप्रकाशो
तत् = नीलाकारत्वम्। यदि प्रतिबिंबबलाद् भवति,
तदा तद् द्वितीयबिंबानवभासात् = for the other
(Bimba) is not manifest (in itself
simultaneously – बिंबाभावे प्रतिबिंबायोगात्।
तथा कारणतावादि = They say that difference
in knowledge is due to difference in
means etc. ते हि एवं कथयन्तिः- एकरूपाः
प्रतीतयः करणवशेनैव (उपायवशेनैव) भिद्यन्ते,
कुत्रचिद्धि किंचिदेव करणं न सर्वं सर्वत्र, तथा प्रमेयेन
वा भिद्यन्ते, न हि सर्वत्र एकमेव प्रमेयम्॥
But – शिखरस्य ज्ञाने बहुतर ...... इति कथं
भवेत् = बहुतर नीलविषये पटु भवति, अन्यत्र
अल्पतर पीतादिविषये, मन्दं भवति,
इति भेदः कथं स्यात् – How can the know-
ledge caused by multiplicity, such as
blue etc, in one, who is at the peak
of a mountain, be clear in the case
of one & indistinct in the case of another
object. प्रकाशशरीरस्य अभेदात् – because
the light of consciousness is one & the
same (this is the criticism of the Budha
view that विज्ञाना (संवेदना) is formless.

प्रकाशशरीरस्य प्रमाणत्वेन स्थितस्य, एकत्वात्, न हि
तत्र उपायभूतस्य प्रमाणस्य भेदः, आदिशब्द-
गृहीतेन प्रमेयातिशयेन ज्ञानातिशयबाधे शास्त्र-

स्थितवस्तुज्ञाने कथमेकत्र पटु अन्यत्र मन्दे भवेत, समीपस्थे हि ज्ञाने पटु भवति दूरस्थे तु तस्मिन्नेव मन्दम्, प्रत्येयैकत्वात् इति हेत्वेन ॥

{तथा भूते च = अभिन्ने संस्कारे → युगपत्सर्वविषयानुभवानुकूले संस्कारे च

.......इति भूयान् संकरः

अन्यतरदर्शनोद्भूते = तत्रानुभूतबहुवस्तुमध्यादेकतरस्य दर्शनेनोद्भूते सति,

बलादेवाशेषस्मरण प्रसङ्गः — तत्रानुभूतसमस्तवस्तुस्मरण प्रसङ्गः

इति अतः कारणात्, भूयान् = अतिबहुः सङ्करः स्यात्, स्मृतौ व्याप्येरिति भावः

अतः कारणात्करणतादिवादस्यापि न युक्तत्वम

So also in the Case of remembrance, इति भावः the residual trace having been revived by the perception of one thing (out of many which were percieved together) the consciousness of all should forcibly follow. Thus there will be great Confusion.

स्यात एतत .... प्रकाशेन इति = But if one were to say "let there be the objects only; what is the use of the admitting the existence of light which causes so great Confusion?

अत्राह .... तत् किं दुष्यते = The Author says in reply that what is not light cannot be said to have existence at all.

स्वात्मनि = प्रकाशास्पृष्टे स्वरूपमात्रे, नकिंचिद्वा = असद्वा, कश्चिद् ब्रूयादिति शेषः

किं दुष्येत = को दोष आयाति, नहि तन्नीलमुत्थाय "नीलोऽहम" इति विवादं कुर्यात्, जडत्वेन मूकत्वादिति भावः ॥

एवमात्मन्यसत्कल्पाः प्रकाशस्यैव सन्त्यमी
जडाः प्रकाश एवास्ति स्वात्मनः स्वपरात्मभिः ॥

तत् = तस्मात् कारणात् , यदि प्रकाशः स्यात् तदा
अर्थो भवति

या घटस्य प्रकाशता वपुर्भवति सैव प्रकाशता पटु-
वपुर्भवति ॥

एकस्यैव प्रकाशस्य .... इति तावत् पर्यवसाययितव्य
तद्द्वैवं पर्यवस्यति , यदि प्रकाशस्य विचित्रभावे हेत्वन्तरमपा - इ-
कृतम् =

Vedant[?]

An objection is raised against the above said by the बहिर्थानुमेयवादिन, a school of Buddhists, who believe in the existence inferable external object. According to them all the worldly transactions, connected with pramana (perception), are dependent upon determinate cognition and that is possible only because there is the direct perception of an external object which has the nature of mere reflection of प्रवृ pravrti-vijnana (consciousness) that is changing and momentary, but the vijnana (बाह्य:) remains really as one. So the Purvapaksin i.e. → न तदात्मिकाभासो बाह्यस्य... (6)

एकस्यैव =

The following are some of the causes, admitted by opponents, to explain the variety in consciousness:

तत्र प्रकाशस्य ..विचित्रस्य............ पर्यवस्यति

(According to Bāhyarthanumeyavadin) the cause of successive changes in light, which is really one, is the reflection. The blue etc., which is similar to this reflection, is the external object. Although that is only inferable, yet because there is the direct perception "this is nila" as also because all the worldly transactions, connected with pramāṇa, are dependent upon determinate cognition, it is spoken as perceptible. The theory of the Budhist, who believes in the existence of the inferable external world, the Author puts forth as a prima facie view :-

एकस्यैव = न तु प्रतिविषयं भिन्नत्वेन स्थितत्वादनेकस्य,
(विषय की नानाता से ज्ञान भिन्न भिन्न नहीं हो सकता)

एवंभूताः = लोके प्रसिद्धत्वाऽप्रसिद्धत्वाभ्यां स्थिताः ये क्रमाक्रमरूपाः कार्यकारणभावादयः ॥

पर्यवसाययितव्यम् = विश्रामयितव्यम् : निश्चेयमिति यावत् ॥.
स्वयं स्वसंविदागमयुक्तिभिः निश्चयेऽपि परस्य युक्तिभिः हृदयंगमीकरणीयम् ॥.

पर्यवस्यति = विश्राम्यति — कथं इति - आह →

हेत्वन्तरम् = स्वव्यतिरिक्तोऽन्यो हेतुः

अपाकृतम् = दूरीकृतम् , अन्यथा भेदापातादिति भावः।
सौत्रान्तिकैरुपगतं हेत्वन्तरं चेद् दूष्यते

(वह कहते हैं कि प्रकाश एक ही है और बाह्य के प्रतिबिंब पड़ने से इस में विचित्रता आती है).

तत्र = सौत्रान्तिकमतमेव तत्र तावद् दर्शयति,
सजातीयं = नीलादिजातीयम्, सदृशम्, बिंबप्रतिबिंबयोः सदृशत्वात्
बाह्यम् = बिंबभूते बाह्ये वस्तु
तत् च = बाह्यम् च, यद्यपि अनुमेयं = प्रतिबिंबाख्य लिङ्गेन अवगतत्वात् अनुमितिविषयो भवति,
प्रत्यक्षेण = प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणेन, संवेदनरूपप्रकाशविच्छेदेन
बाह्यार्थवादिकथितमिति ...... = तस्मादेकस्यैव बोधस्य क्रमिकानाभासात्प्रतिबिम्बकल्पनेनार्पयितुं चतुरस्तदृच्छायाधारी बाह्योऽर्थवर्गः कल्पनीयोऽनुमानेनेति ॥

(According to the Vijñānavādi) the light of Consciousness (बोध) has no variety. In reality it is pure light. For, if the "blue" etc. be different from light of Consciousness then they, in their essential nature being different from 'light' (i.e. being of nature of darkness) would not shine at all. But if it be supposed to shine as blue as its nature, how pita would shine? And even if it be ~~pita~~ supposed that its nature is to shine in succession as nila and pita etc., then the Consciousness of Self as free from affection of external objects, in the state of deep sleep will not be possible. Therefore light is light only. It has no form that is different from it in any way. "Light has no variety". This light which has no variety, can not be represented to be the cause of different manifestations, such as nila at one time

and pita at another, because there cannot be ~~variety~~ diversity in the effect, if it be not present in the cause. Therefore the variety of manifestations of nila and pitaetc being without any ~~possible~~ perceptible cause, leads to the inference of the external, which is responsible for the reflection that appears in the light of Consciousness (विज्ञाना). The inferred is, of course, similar to the reflection it casts. It has diversity corresponding to the reflections, falling on light of Consciousness (विज्ञाना) in due succession and in every way different from it (Consciousness). This is the possibility according to him who believes in the separate existence of external objects. This is not a mere possibility but it borders on certainity.

These accidental affections ← i.e. variety in manifestation of objects.

तत्तदाकस्मिकाभासो बाह्यं चेदनुमापयेत् ।
न ह्यभिन्नस्य बोधस्य विचित्राभासहेतुता ॥ ४ ॥

योजना: अभिन्नस्य (अविचित्रस्य) बोधस्य विचित्राभास- हेतुता नहि (संभवति) (युक्तः), (अतः) तत् तद् आकस्मिक-आभासः (अज्ञातहेतुकभावाभासः) बाह्यम् अनुमापयेत् चेत्? (चेदिति निपातो – यदि बाह्यार्थवादिना उच्यते – अथवा – बाह्यार्थवादिना संभाव्यमानतामाह).

Eng: "The light of Consciousness (Bodha) being without diversity in itself, cannot be the cause of variety in manifestation (in determinate cognition. Therefore, this (variety in manifestations) without any perceptible cause, leads to the inference of the external.

न वासना प्रबोधोऽत्र विचित्रो हेतुतामियात् ।
तस्यापि तत्प्रबोधस्य वैचित्र्ये किं निबन्धनम् ॥५॥

योजना:- विचित्र: वासनाप्रबोध अत्र (अर्थाभासवैचित्र्ये) तस्य (वैचित्र्यस्य) हेतुतां न इयाद् अपि, तत्- प्रबोधस्य वैचित्र्ये निबन्धने किम् ?

Exp: (1) The revival of variety in Vāsna cannot be represented to be the Cause. For, there is no answer to the question "What is the Cause of the variety in the revival of Vāsna?"

अभिन्न: = भेदरहित:, परमार्थ: = सहज स्वरूपम्,

प्रकाशाधिकम् = प्रकाशाख्य स्वरूपादधिके

अस्य = बोधस्य , तत् = नीलाख्यं रूपम् ,

अप्रकाशरूपम् = न हि जडस्य नीलस्य प्रकाशत्वं युक्तम् इति भाव:

प्रकाशत्वम् = नील प्रकाशभाव:

पीत प्रकाश: कथं स्यात् = नीलस्य पीताद्भेदात् ।

अथापि क्रमिक नील पीतादि प्रकाशरूपमेव = Even if it be supposed that its nature is to shine in succession as Nila & pita.

तस्य = बोधस्य, नीलाद्याभासशून्यो------

न स्यात् = ~~अहंभाव~~ अहंमात्राभासत्वेन नीलाभासरहित:

स्वापाद्यवस्थातु = सुप्तिमूर्छाद्यवस्थासु , तत्र स्थितोऽप्याभास: प्रकाशमात्रविषयत्वेन परामर्शानारूढत्वाद सत्कल्प एव न तु परमार्थतोऽसन् अज्ञान साक्षितया स्थितत्वात् , अन्यथा "न किंचिदवेदिषम" इत्युत्तरकालीन स्मृत्ययोगादिति भाव:

तथा च न नीलाद्याभासोऽस्य स्वरूपमिति भाव: ॥

The pūrvapakṣin further says:—

(iii) The rise of vāsanā being of the nature विचित्र:, cannot be assumed to be its cause (न हेतुतामस्-इतान्) i.e vāsanā according to the view of विज्ञानवादिन् is nothing but the residual trace of impressions (संस्कार:), so it cannot be taken to be cause of the variety in manifestations. For, then question will arise "What is the cause of variety in the rise of vāsana (तत्प्रबोधस्य विचित्रस्य किं निबन्धनम्)?. (Kaw).

रूपान्तरम् = नीलादिस्वरूपम् अन्यस्वरूपम् ॥

तस्य च अभिन्न बोधस्य , तत्र = विचित्राभासेषु

कारणत्वम् = प्रकाशस्य

हेतौ अभिन्ने कार्यभेदस्य असंभवात = There cannot be variety in the effect if it be not present in the Cause.

तस्मात बाह्यं = बाह्यवस्तु अनुमापयति इति शेषः

बाह्यं कीदृशम् ? विज्ञाने = ग्रहणोन्मुखे अभिन्नतया प्रोक्ते बोधे, गतः = आकारत्वेन भासमानः , अत एव प्रतिबिम्बरूपः यः स्वः स्वभावः तस्य संपादकम् ।

तथा औचित्यात = युक्तोचेन

तथा क्रमेण उपनिपतन्तः रूपानाम् ये अतिबहवः भेदा ते आत्मा यस्य तादृशम , तथा अनात = अभिन्नतया बोधात् पृथग्भूतम् अनुमापयते = अनुमितिं प्रति कर्तृत्वे भजन्ते प्रमातारं इति संभावयते = ऐसी वह संभावना करते हैं । प्रेरयति

न च अस्य .... निश्चय पर्यवसायि एव भवति = केवल संभावना ही नहीं करते ~~+~~ ऐसा निश्चय करते हैं ॥ It is not a possibility but borders on certainity.

विज्ञानवादिना ..... स न उपपद्यते = The reason that has been given to account for difference in perception, namely the revival of Vāsana is not sound; be

स्मृतिजनकः .... वर्तते = Because Vāsna is nothing else than the Sānskār of Impressions & it is responsible for remembrance. But here we have to look for the Cause of difference in direct perception (to which difference in Vāsna may be considered to be due, because of which there is consequent difference in perception, due the revival of Vāsna (according to विज्ञानवादिनः.

पर्येषणीयः = विचारणीयः

अस्तु वा .... वासना = Or let us accept (the Vignani-vadinas Conceptions of Vāsna & its probhodha, namely) that vasana is nothing else than the power of of light of Consciousness (ज्ञाना) capable of making the (supposed) external objects manifest.

तस्याश्च = तत्र तस्याश्च ...... इति = That probhodha
प्राक्ति: is its state of preparedness to do its work & also that diversity in the objective aspects of experiences is due to revivals.

तत्रापि - सौत्रान्तिकोक्ति:

यद्यपि .... अङ्गीकार्यम् = Although in regard to those objects which are within the light of Consciousness (ज्ञाना), it can be said that their shining (existence - सत्ता सत्त्वे) सत्ता is unreal, yet that which is the cause of these manifestations has to be accepted to be real.

अवस्तुन .... स्वभावानुपपत्ते: = For, nothing the chief characteristic of which is that is without any capacity, can have, as its essential nature, the capacity to accomplish something.

एवं - स्थिते .... बाह्यार्थवादप्रकार एव = under these circumstances, if these vāsnās which are represented to be the cause of objective manifestation, are admitted to be different from light of Consciousness and to have and to have got real existence, then this (विज्ञानवादा:) also is but बाह्यार्थवादा:, but in different words.

अथ संवृतिसत् ...... अनुपपत्तिः = But if these Vāsnās also are represented to be have immaginary existence, then, as such they cannot be represented to be the causes of different perceptions.

अथ येन रूपेण .... कार्यभेदस्य असिद्धेः - But if it is said: they are the causes only in that aspect in which they are real, then their aspect is only pure knowledge (विज्ञान) and that has no diversity. Therefore, diversity in the effect (in wordly objects) cannot be explained.

एवं वासनानाम् .... का प्रत्याशा = Thus there being no essential diversity in Vāsnās what hope can there be of there being any variety in their revival.

भवन्तु वा वासना भिन्नाः .... इति एक एव प्रबोधः - *इति सममेव ... भासते ॥

प्रबोधकाभिमतस्य = प्रबोधकत्वेनाभिमतस्य, प्रबोधः = आभासरूपः वासनाप्रबोधः

सममेव = युगपत्,

or let there be different Vāsnās. But there being nothing different from the light of consciousness (बोधात्) truely existent such as time, space etc, which can be represented to be revivers of different Vāsnās, and therefore, there being no variety and so there being only one revival, all things should shine simultaneously.

अथ .... तदसत्,

स्वसन्तानवर्तीनि ज्ञानान्तराणि = नीलादिज्ञानक्षणसमूहरूपे निजे सन्ताने वर्तन्ते - प्रकाशरूपात् अभिन्नात् ज्ञानात् अन्यानि ज्ञानानि,

The view that other (objective) cognitions, which are within the chain of self luminous self consciousness, are the various causes

सिद्धेऽपि ...... अस्य असिद्धेः = And even if it be established to exist as an object it would be nothing more than light of consciousness (ज्ञान:) in its essential nature, like body etc., For if it be adm

of revival of different residual traces, is not sound.

सुखदुःख .... अनुपपत्ते =

बोधवैलक्षण्यानुपपत्ते = तथा च बोधान्तराणीति ~~विज्ञानान्येव~~
~~बोधान्तराणि नैकप्रमातृगतानि तथा च न~~ कथनमयुक्तं
तेन च वासनाप्रबोधवैचित्र्यमप्ययुक्तमेव इति भावः

Because all differences, whether in respect of pleasure or pain, nila or pita or former or later time or place, are essentially of the nature of light of Consciousness (विज्ञाना:) and विज्ञाना is in reality nothing else than "light" itself, therefore, there being no possibility of difference in their essential nature there is no possibility of difference in cognitions.

परप्रमातृरूपेषु .... इति न विघ्नः ॥

अवैलक्षण्य प्रकारः = अभेद प्रकारः, तत्रापि बाधमात्रस्यैकत्वात् कायाद्युपाधिकृतभेदस्य अकिंचित्करत्वात् इति भावः,

परकीयाभिमतस्य = अन्य संबन्धित्वनाभिमतस्य, बौद्धमते गुणसमूहस्यैव गुणित्वात् "कृशा" इति उक्तम्,

अनुमात्रभिमतम् = अनुमानकर्तृत्वेन कल्पितम्, यत संविन्मात्रं तस्य यद्रूपं तस्मादभेदे विज्ञानमात्ररूपत्वेन भेदाभावे सति ॥.

परत्वं कस्य भवेदिति न विघ्नः — जानीमः

Even in the case of other lights of Consciousness (Bodhas) in the form of other Subjects which are called other Chains, the

impossibility of difference is common. For in the case of those other chains of lights of consciousness also, thin or fat body, vital air, breathing in or out, qualities of intellect, pleasure or pain, which are thought to belong to others, are really one with that light of consciousness, which is looked upon as inferer; we therefore fail to understand, "What then remains which can be represented to be another".

बोधस्य .... तत् असन् एव =

तन्निष्ठस्य = परनिष्ठस्य , सोऽपि = बोधः

प्रमाणेन = प्रत्यक्षादिना , तत् = तर्हि –

If it were said that it is the light of consciousness (Bodha) which is present in what is called another chain, we would reply that the existence of that not having been established by any means of right knowledge, it is as good as nought.

सिद्धोऽपि .... जड एव

प्रमेयतया = वेद्यतया – तथापि = जडत्वेऽपि

न असौ प्रमेयतया सिद्धः अपि तु प्रमातृभावेन

ज्ञानमात्रस्वभावः = परनिष्ठो बोधः सोऽपि जड इत्यर्थः

स्वसंविन्मात्ररूपत्वे = स्वस्य ज्ञानमात्ररूपत्वे ·

अस्य = परनिष्ठबोधस्यासिद्धिः ज्ञानानां परस्पर संवेदनात् इति भाव

ननु व्याहारादिक्रिया .... भाव्यम् ॥

व्याहारादिक्रिया = वचनादिरूपा क्रिया, आदिशब्देन स्पन्दादिक्रिया ग्रहणम्

तत् = तस्मात कारणात्, यया = दृश्यमानया चैत्रकार्यादि व्याहारक्रियया

तत् हेतुकया = इच्छाहेतुकया, भाव्यम = अवश्यं भवनीयम्, मम व्याहारादिक्रियावदिति भावः

[illegible]

(The vijñānavādin might attempt to prove the existence of another Subject as follows).

"In ourselves we have experienced that such an activity as that of speaking is invariably preceded by desire to speak, as its necessary Cause. Therefore we infer that in the case of another person, such as Chaitra, also such an activity must be preceded by similar desire. (i.e. when we hear another person speak we know by inference that his speech also must have been preceded by desire)

न च मत् संतति पतिता .... इति = But we know from our own experience that, that desire is not in the chain, which we call ours. Thus it is clear that desire is another's and, therefore, that chain, to which that desire belongs, is another's.

अत्रो च्यते = To this the reply is as follows:

इह अनुमातुः .... ततो हेतोः समीहा अनुमीयेते,

व्याप्तिग्रहणकाले = परव्याहारो हि समीहापूर्वको भवितुमर्हति मम व्याहारवत् इति व्याप्तिः॥

अविच्छेद प्राणोऽहे = अहं विश्रान्तित्वेन स्वतो भेदरहितः

विच्छेदजीवितः = भेद प्राणः, परनिष्ठतया स्फूर्तेरिति भावः

इति विच्छेद जीवित = अविच्छेद प्राणस्य अहमिति हि अस्मदर्थे विश्रान्तित्वाद विच्छेदजीवितत्वम्,

अन्यस्य = अव अविच्छेद प्राणस्य, व्याप्तिः = निजसमीहया सह व्याप्यव्यापक भावः संबन्धः

इदानीम् = अनुमानकाले

अन्यश्च = विच्छेदप्राणः, हेतुः = परसमीहाया गमकः

हेतु = समीहारूपः, अविदित एव = न हि परसमीहा, कस्यापि प्रत्यक्षेति भावः,

ततो हेतुः = अविदिताद् हेतुः

*.1 → The experience of Speech in the inferer is in two ways: (i) at the time of acquiring the idea of invariable Concomittance - the experience is related to the Subject as "I Speak", but (ii) at the time of inference it is related to the object, as "This (man) speaks". Hence the idea of invariable Concomittance is related to something else than that (ie different type of reason from that) which is directly experienced. How can then the latter be the reason for inference? The Cause of experience "this man speak" being unknown, how can the inference of another's desire from it be possible?

किंच 'व्याहरति अयम्' इति य......... एवंभूतार्थसिद्ध्यधीनत्वेन इतरेतराश्रयात् ॥

~~अनुमातृ प्रमात्रान्तरे~~ऽनुमातृसंमते = व्याहर्तृरूपात्प्रमातुरन्यस्मिन्,
परसमीहाया = अविदितत्वात्तस्या, तस्या हि.... ननु विच्छेदमयस्य भासस्य परसमीहा कार्यं माभवतु तया कारणभूतः विच्छेदमयः आभास, एव कार्यं स्यात् इति आह तथाभूत-

तस्या = परसमीहाया,

अविच्छेदजीवितः = स्वात्माविच्छेद प्राणाः

अविच्छेदमयस्य = व्याहरामि इत्येवं रूपाभासस्य, विच्छेदमयः = व्याहरत्ययमित्येवं रूपः

२ युक्तम = दूरत्वात् इति बोध्यम्

तथाभूतस्य = तथारूपस्य, कुतोभाव इत्यत आह 'नहि' इति

कुतो न सिद्धमित्यत आह – परप्रमातृसिद्धौ हि 'परत्र' इति कथं युक्तं स्यात्, न च तत्सिद्धिरस्ति, एकस्य बोधमात्रस्य स्थितत्वादिति भावः

एवंभूतः — अप्रसिद्धः योऽर्थः — पराऽयं वस्तु, तत्राधीत्वीन-अाया-तत्वेन.
इतरेतराश्रयात् = परसिद्धौ अनुमानसिद्धौ च ....

किं च व्याहारति .... अर्थकार्यः स्यात् ।। Further, how can the experience "This man speak" which is related to the object, the other subject, be admitted by the inferer to be the effect of another's desire, which is intended to be inferred; For the effect of the desire (of which the inferer has the experience) is "I speak" and that is related to the subject; It is not right to admit that the effect of what is essentially subjective is objective in its essential nature, because we have no means of right knowledge, that the subjective cause produces objective effect, such as "this man speaks" The experience 'this man speaks" depends upon establishing the existence of another subject + existence of latter depends upon the former, the argument therefore has the fallacy of interdependence of two terms.

(margin: तस्यापि .... अविदंदजीवित ..... इतरेतराश्रयात्; for it is not so established by any means of right knowledge)

न च अवश्यम् .... व्यभिचारात् = कदाचिद् केवलोऽविदंद्श्च एवाभासो दृश्यते इति भावः

It is not universally true that the effect of the subjective is the objective, because there are exceptions.

(margin: अनुमान हर समय व्यवहार में बरती जाती है ।।)

न च .... तदुत्पपत्ति नियता = Nor is the rise of another subject necessarily due to the determinate will (अनुसंधानात्) "let another subject also come into being" of the inferer,

तत्सद्भावेऽपि .... च उत्पत्ते = For, even one is, the other is not + vice versa.

(अविदिच्छाभासाश्रयानुमातृसद्भावेऽपि, अस्य = विदिच्छाभासस्य, अनुत्पत्ते = उत्पादनाभवात्, नहि परव्याहारस्य तत्रावश्यंभाव इति भावः)

किंच "व्याहरति अयम्" ...... कथं कार्यः स्यात् ॥

For how can the experience "This man speaks" which is related to the object, the other subject be admitted by the inferer to be effect of another's desire which is intended to be inferred.

~~न च अवि इच्छेदमस्य ...... इति युक्तम् ॥ →~~

~~For the effect of the~~

तस्या हि व्याहरामीत्याभासः ...... अविच्छेदे ऽनुमितः = For the effect of the desire (of which the inferrer has the experience) is "I speak" and that is related to the subject.

न च अविच्छेदमस्य ..... युक्तम् ॥ → It is not right to admit that the effect of what is essentially subjective is objective in its essential nature.

तथाभूत कार्यकारणभाव .... अभावात् → because we have no means of knowing such essential relation ~~that the subjective cause produces objective effect~~ as ~~"this man speaks"~~.

P.T.O.

All India Saraswat Cultural Organisation
(अखिलभारत सांस्कृतिक संस्था जम्मू व कश्मीर प्रदेश)
JAMMU & KASHMIR REGION.

JALALI NIVAS
Kuran Nagar, Srinagar-190010
(Kashmir)

Dated ______ 197

स्वात्मनि चाऽन्यत्र ग्राहिकाभासः स
------ जनयति = that the subjective Cause produces objective effect such as "this man speaks"

परसिद्धिपूर्वकत्वात् .... परप्रमातृसिद्धेश्च
The experience "this man speaks" depends upon establishing the existence of another Subject.

एवंभूतार्थसिद्ध्यपेक्षित्वेन --- इतरेतराश्रयः
& the existence of the latter depends upon the former & the argument therefore has the fallacy of interdependence of two terms

Page 53 + ...

स्वलक्षणाभासं →

'स्व' → स्वरूपे संकोचं भजति इति तादृशम् - असाधारम् -

लक्षनम् → स्वरूपम्.

विशेष्यत्वेन देशादि● ययोजनामयम इति देशादिग्रहणम् — यस्य.

आभासं → प्रकाशं

सजातीय विजातीय परावृत्तं स्वलक्षणं तच्च निर्विकल्पस्य. विषयं

ज्ञानरूकं → ~~प्रत्यक्षवादि~~ प्रत्यक्षात्मनवादिः

प्रति → स्फुरात्मकाभासं स्वलक्षणाऽनुभवरूपम् निर्विकल्पकं ते कथयन्ति ॥

परं = अनन्तर → ततः परम् — तस्मात्

ज्ञानात् अन्यरूप → विकल्पकं ज्ञानम् प्रादुर्भवति इति प्राहुः -

सर्वस्य इत्यादि विकल्पस्य साक्षान्न निर्विकल्प मूलत्वात् ॥

बहुधा → अन्यस्वरूप ग्रहणकाले, स्वरूपाणां
भिन्नत्वात्

Page 49-50.

अनुभव → प्रत्यक्षज्ञाने   स्मृतिः ... = पूर्वानुभूतविषया – अनुभवसारिणी.

न नित्या → स्थिर न स्यात्

न किञ्चित् स्मृतिविषयस्य भवनेन ध्वंसनेन वा इति भावः

अनुभवः, पूर्वकालीन इति शेषः

इत्यत्र = स्मृतौ   प्रत्यक्षज्ञाने

तमेव च अनुसन्धाना → अनुभवं अपेक्षमाणा

प्रकाशः ग्रहणम्   अनुसरन्ती

अध्यवसायः → तत्तामनन्तरभावि सविकल्पज्ञाने

अंगुलिद्वयवत् ... → अर्थानुभवयो सम प्रधान तथापि प्रकाशः न इति दर्शितम्

० अंगुलिन्यायेन० युगपत्प्रकाशो ॥

अध्यवसायश्च
इति योज्यम् ॥

page 62

सात्याप्यात्मनि ....

साद्दग् अनुभव एव द्वारम् उपायो यस्याः सा
अनुभूतिषु नीलादि वस्तुषु
स्मृति : भवन्तीति शेष:

Sogata says even if you admit that there exists a permanent self whose nature is knowledge (बोधात्मनि) the direct perception having ceased to exist how do you account for the remembrance of things experienced through that perception. He himself answers & says, it is because Remembrance has its object the same thing that was the object of the former direct perception. For this reason the Saugata thinks that although the direct perception of former time does not exist at the time of later remembrance, it can still be the object of the remembrance.

(१ अस्तोऽर्थोनुभवस्य विषयेण सा विषयवती

page 63-64

Atmavadin questions 'how can remembrance claim to have the same thing as its object that was the object of the former direct perception which is not existing at the time of remembrance- The Saugata says it is because the rise of memory is due to residual traces of former direct perception. So he concludes that if it be so what is the use of permanent Self which is a superfluous entity.

1. Rice
2. firewood
3. oil.
4. meat.
5. veg.
6. Masalah.

1. place.
2. Utensils.
3. Bricks.
4. Mitti.
5. Lakdi.
6. Barley.
7. Til.
8. Mash.
9. Jalomul.
10. Walnuts.
11. Atā.
12. Flowers.
13. Dalcshini.
14.

1. Meat 3 Kg. — 30/-
2. Veg. Mandi-nadru 8/-
3. Mulichalne — 1/-
4. Dahi. — 7/-
5. milk. — 3/-
6. Sheer-Chai.

50/-
Dresser 10/-

60/-

(तदभावे च = अनुमात्र भावे च, न हि अनुमातृ सन्निधावेव परो व्यवहर-तीति भावः).

विदिच्छत्र आभासः .... इति व्याप्तेरेव असिद्धिः = Further the determinate will "Let another Subject come into being" which is supposed to be Cause of another Subject, cannot be known to have any Causal relation with another Subject unless the otherness be established. Hence there can be no idea of invariable Con-comittance between the two.

प्रमात्रान्तराणि चयदि .... इति व्याघात: And if other Subjects are different from one another, the objects also, which shine as resting on them, would be necessarily different, because the recognised view is that the objective aspect of Consciousness is not essentially different from the Subjective.

ततश्च .... न स्यात् = Hence all the Subjects being not related to the same object, the co-operation of many Subjects, which is based on their relation to the same object, should be out of question. ततश्च ज्ञानरूपाणां प्रमातॄणां परस्पर भेदे प्रति-प्रमातृ अर्थभेदोपि युक्त एवेति भावः। तदेव वस्तु एकं प्रति तद्रूपम् अन्यं प्रति अतद्रूपं न किंचिद्वा स्यात् ततश्च तद्विषयो व्यवहारोपि प्रति प्रमातृ भिन्न एव स्यादिति भावः॥

इति अन्योन्यानुपरक्तं .... आपद्येत = Thus, the people, unattached to one another, should be as if under the influence of Spirit.

अनुमीयमानमपि च .... तावत् संभवः = And if the other Subjects, which is being inferred, be different from that which is taken to be inferer

then of course, there can be the possibility that the object of cognition is different from the light of Consciousness (बोधात्)

प्रमेयं बोधाद् भिन्नम् भवति = प्रमेयभूतबोधान्तरवदिति शेषः

सहोपलम्भनियमाद् ---------- न सह्यते, But then the

सहोपलम्भनियमात् law "the knowledge and its objects are one", because of their invariable concomitance" being not universally valid, what harm have blue etc done that their separate existence is not tolerated.

ननु प्रमेयस्य बोधेन सहोपलम्भ एव दृश्यते इति कथं तस्य ततो भेदो युक्त इत्यत आह 'सहोपलम्भ' इति,

अनैकान्तिकत्वात् = व्यभिचारात्, सुषुप्त्यादि अवस्थासु हि प्रमेयं विना केवलो बोध एवानुभूयते, यद्यपि तत्र अज्ञानस्य प्रमेयत्वम् तदपि न किंचिदेवेति भावः, ननु अथं संभवोऽस्तु का हानि इति आह, 'नील' इति, प्रमेयभूतबोधवत् नीलादिरूपस्य प्रमेयस्यापि प्रमातृभिन्नत्वमायाति तच्च नेष्टमिति भावः — अ फलितमाह, तस्मात् इति.

तस्मात् ----- नियमे हेत्वन्तराभावात् इति =
Therefore the separate existence of separate subjects is to be considered as not established. But if it is considered as established, then all the objective ideas (आभासाः) which are within different subjects would simultaneously bring about the revival of residual traces which are responsible for difference in the cognition objects of cognitions.

तथापि ------- अनुपपत्तिरेव = For there is no reason why only a particular residual trace should be revived. Therefore, even if other subjects be admitted to exist, the difference of objects such as blue etc from one another cannot be established (for the difference is due to their appearance in consciousness in order of succession).

ततश्च स्थितमेतत् .... द्योतकः = Thus the

एवंवासनानां तदुद्बोधहेतूनां च विचित्र्यानुपपत्तेः

difference in the residual traces as well as in the causes, responsible for their revival, cannot be shown to be consistent with reason. Therefore this is established that light (consciousness) — Bodha has no variety in itself. And because it cannot reasonably be supposed to be the cause of the inexplicable diversity that appears in it, therefore we have to admit the possibility of the inferable external object. "If Bāhyārthavādin were to say this". This is the meaning of these two verses. The word "चेत" indicates that the statement contained in them is simply prima facie view. Thus the supposition of the Bāhyārthavādin is presented to be a strong prima facie view.

Kaw's version : स्यादेतद् = There may be the possibility of admitting the existence of objects, but there is another possibility also, i.e.

परसंभावना = बाह्यार्थवादिनः , दर्शिता = विज्ञाननय-प्रतिषेधात्,

Since all the transactions are performed by means of the various manifestations, what is then the use of admitting the external objects whose existence cannot be established by reason.

Now to weaken the supposition, he says the following. (The teacher says).

स्यादेतदवभासेषु तेष्वेवावसिते सति।
व्यवहारे किमन्येन बाह्येनानुपपत्तिना ॥ ६ ॥

योजनाः — स्याद् एतत्, व्यवहारे तेषु एव अवभासेषु अवसिते (संमाप्ते) सति, अन्येन अनुपपत्तिना बाह्येन किम्?

Eng: "May be, that all the transactions being possible on the basis of those various manifestations, what is the use of admitting the external, in support of which there are no reasons."

"स्यादेतत्" इत्यस्य द्विधा व्याख्यां करोति। , या संभावना = बाह्यार्थ-संभावना

तस्य अभ्युपगमे = अङ्गीकारे , यदा व्याख्यायते = व्याख्याविषयतां नीयते

तच्छैथिल्यविषयम् = पूर्वोक्तसंभावनाशिथिलताविषयम्, तद्द्योतकमिति यावत्

संभावनान्तरम् = बाह्यानुपपत्तिरूपा अन्या संभावना,

शेषश्लोकेन = "अवभासेषु" इत्यादिना श्लोकशेषेण,

"किन्तु" इत्यस्य व्याख्या कीया इत्यर्थः। अस्यैव द्वितीयां व्याख्यां कर्तुमाह "यदि तु" इति।

another version ← "स्यादेतत" इति — denotes absence of between the supposition, referred to above, and another which is being stated in this verse.

अध्याहारो न सह्यते = बुद्धिसंनिहितस्य व्याख्यानावसरे समुच्चारणमध्याहारः —

"किंतु" का add करना यदि तुम न सहते

स्यादेतत इति → अधिकमिदं संभावनान्तरमिति,

एकवाक्यतया = "संभवते" वाक्य से ।

अनयापि = अनमारूपया , तै = बाह्यैः , तै = अर्थ प्रतिबिंब तथा कल्पितैः

ननु ते मद् दर्शने न सन्तीत्यत आह, "आभासै" इति

व्यवहारसिद्धेः = "यादृशो यक्षस्तादृशो बलिः" इति नीत्याश्रयणे आभासरूपस्य व्यवहारस्य आभासरूपैरेवार्थैः सिद्धियुक्ति इति भावः -

यत्र = यस्मिन् बाह्ये

What have you got to do with the supposition of existence of external thing, which is difficult to maintain? For all the worldly transactions can be well explained by the subjective affects (Ābhāsās) which are accepted by you, and no transaction is possible with what is always a matter of inference only. What is therefore the use of believing in the existence of the external, which lacks the support of the reason?

बाधकं च प्रकाशात् भेदे अनुमेयतयापि प्रकाशनाभाव इः

As for the reason against it, the chief one of ~~which~~ (मुख्यम्) is that if we believe in the existence of external things as different from light of consciousness, it will be impossible to establish even by ~~difference~~ experience that they shine (or are manifest).

अभ्युच्चयबाधकास्तु = And additional reasons against it are :-- . -*- (~~next page~~)

By the additional Badak - by द्वितै बाधः :

Pramana he establishes first that external objects are nothing. That a whole cannot be a part i.e. there is no समवाय संबंध between whole & part. because of भेदादि विरुद्ध धर्म योग :

Secondly by refuting Kanāda's atomic theory.

Besides, it is not possible to prove that the 'whole' (अवयवि) consisting of parts exists in parts by the relation of inherence (समवाय-वृत्ति).

अवयविनो वृत्त्यनुपपत्तिः = पटादिरूपस्य, अर्थादवयवेषु तन्त्वादिषु

अनुपपत्तिः = स्थित्ययोगः, अवयविनो बाधिका। तथा हि, ~~अवयवि~~ अवयवी सर्वेष्ववयवेषु तिष्ठति एकत्र वा, यदि सर्वेषु, तत्रापि किं सामस्त्येन व्यस्तत्वेन वा, सामस्त्येन स्थितौ अवयवेष्वेव अवयविव्यवहारसिद्धौ अवयविकल्पना व्यर्था, व्यस्तत्वेन तु एकत्र अवयविसमाप्तेः अन्येषु कः तिष्ठते। यदि एकत्र इति पक्षः तदा अन्येषामनवयवत्व-प्रसङ्गः, अवयव्याश्रित एव ह्यवयवो भवति।

"समवायासिद्धिः" इति, अवयवेषु समवायेन अवयवी तिष्ठतीति तु सुप्रसिद्धम्। समवायस्य तत्र केन तिष्ठति संयोगस्यासम्भवात्, समवायेन इति चेत् सोऽपि केनेत्य-अनवस्थाऽऽपातः। अथवा सन्निवेशेन तेष्वेवं तन्तुषु समवायकल्पनया समवायस्य परमार्थतोऽसिद्धिरेव॥

"कम्पाकंप" इति, पटादेर्हि एकत्र पार्श्वे चाल्यमाने कंपः अन्यत्र अकंपः, तत् च तस्यैकात्वे न युज्यते। एवम्-आवरणानावरणादौ ज्ञेयम्।

दिग्भागेन कृतः भेदः = पूर्वापरादिरूपः, दिग्भागभेदः

ननु अवयवी मास्तु परमाणव एव संचीयमाना बाह्यी-भवन्तीत्यत आह "अणु" इति॥

अवयवः = A part, a portion (as of a whole).

अवयविन् = Having portions or sub-divisions (as a whole).

अवयवी = A whole

(i) The existence of Avayavin in Avyava is not possible i.e. the Avayavin can not be said to be inherently (by relation of Samvāya) be connected with Avyava.

(ii) Samvāya can not be established.

(iii) There is this unwelcome consequence also that it (Avyavin) will have opposite attributes such as motion and motionlessness

Cover and exposure, redness & its opposite & spatial divisions. Even according to the view (of the (Anusanchāya Bahyaiyavādin Budha) that the -*. external object is nothing more than a Collection of atoms, the atoms alone exist.

This Collection of atoms which has no independent entity of its own, & which is quite diff. from the atom — & when the collection is not there, it is only an atom & nothing more.

विरुद्धधर्मयोगः = इति मूर्ते बाधः

-*. अनुसंचय बाह्यवादेऽपि सञ्चयस्य .... अणव एव. (बाह्यं न भवतीति योजना,) For the Collection is not an idependent entity.

(परमाणुव्यतिरिक्तस्य,) — अन्यस्य = परमाणुविलक्षणस्य.

तच यदि .... इति न किंचित अवशिष्यते बाह्ये तत्वत :॥

ते च = परमाणवश्च, तत् = तदा

दिग्भागभेदः = षटसु दिक्षु भागषट्कभेदापत्तिः, सा च भवतां नेष्टति भावः

देवनाक्षे = क्रीडनरूपे अक्षे, ननु परमाणवो दिग्भागभेदेन न तिष्ठन्ति, किन्तु एकस्य मध्यगस्य स्थाने लगन्ति इत्यत आह "षटसु" इति

एकपरमाणुमात्रता = अन्येषां तत्रैव लग्नत्वात्, तथा च सर्व-पदार्थीनाम् अदृश्यत्वमेवापतेत इति भावः,

And if they get enter into ie get Conjoined Closely without leaving any space between them selves, then the atoms shall have to be supposed to be having parts, facing each other one of the six quarters, for other wise if for instance, there be placed six atoms on different angles of a hexagon, then (union taking place) if at that very place of the Central atom, where one atom has got Connected with it, the others also have to be Connected, only oneness of atom will be the outcome., if therefore, it is to be supposed that different atoms get Connected

with different parts of the central atom, then the conclusion of its having got parts is inevitable. But if it be said that that part only of the atom, with which another gets connected, is real, we would again advance the same argument (to refute it). Therefore in reality there remains nothing external.

अवश्यं भागभेदापत्तिः = तथा च परमाणुता कथमिति शेषः ॥

भाग एव परमार्थसन् = अणु इति योऽयम् ।

न चैतत वाच्यम् = ~~भिन्नदेशत्वादित्यर्थः~~ तदेकपरमाणुमात्रता इत्येतदेव समर्थयति

एकदेशत्वायोगात् = भिन्नदेशत्वादित्यर्थः। "न च" इति

संयोगे सति, = एकदेशे ऽवस्थानासंभवात्।

भिन्नदेशत्वाऽव्यावृत्ते = भिन्नदेशत्वावश्यंभावात्,

तन्निष्ठम् = अर्थात्परमाणुद्वयनिष्ठम् - - स्थूलनिष्ठम्-

द्व्यणुके = द्वाभ्यां संयुक्ताभ्यां

कार्यद्रव्यं = किंचित्स्थूलम्। अणुपरिमाणम् = अणवात्पपरिमाणमणुयुक्तम्

अवयवि-वादो हि अयम् = यह अवयवि वाद ही है - उस का हम ने दूषण किया

It is not possible to prove that the whole (Avyavi, consisting of parts) exists in parts by the relation of inherence (समवाय-सिद्धि)

अव्याप्यवृत्तित्वे = स्वात्यन्ताभावसमानाधिकरणत्वम् -

निरंशे = अवयवरहितपरमाणौ

च स्वाश्रये = परमाणुद्वयरूपे निजाश्रये,

असौ = संयोगः, समवायवृत्त्या तिष्ठति, अस्य = संयोगस्य

ननु अत्र विस्तारयोग्ये कथं न विस्तारः कृतः इत्यत आह 'अभ्युच्चयै
भरः = अतिशयः, प्रयत्नातिशयः इति.

Nor Can it be Said (by the Naiyāyika) that because those which have definite dimention (मूर्ताः) (i.e. the atoms, constituting a binary) must necessarily be related to a number of Spatial points (cannot be having only one place as is supposed by some) and because relation with different spatial points is to be admitted, when the two things are related by Samyoga, therefore there is binary substance, the being of which involves 2 atoms but which is the same in size as atom and has grossness in it: when these & three unite, there is a pre perception-able object, for this is only Avayavi-Vāda, and this has already been refuted.

Further, in the Vaiseshika System is admitted to be Avyāpyavritti i.e. it partly inheres in the thing. But how can this partial inherence be possible in the case of atom which has got no parts? If it be said that Conjunction inheres only in that which is its substratum: I would ask, what then remains that it can not pervade. This is an additional argument against the Vaishesika theory. Therefore we have not taken pain to to state it at length. This point has been very elaborately dealt with in the Pragnalankara by Acharya Shankaranande.

The Purvapaksin says :-

ननु बाधकं नाम .... समर्थम् = The destructive reason is futile when the reverse of what it seeks to prove is established as certain by another proof: तेनैव दृढेन .... संपादनात = For, that very strong proof proves the invalidity of the destructive reason.

दर्शितं च इह .... = And we have given the reason in support of our theory that external objects exist as the cause of cause of the effect (reflection) in the verse: "Those accidental affections".

[illegible]

तेनैव = सिद्धिहेतुनैव , ननु बाधकं बाधितं भवतु, साधकं प्रमाणं च नास्तीत्यत्र किं कुर्मः इत्यत्राह "दर्शितञ्च" इति.

कार्यहेतुः = प्रतिबिंबरूपः कार्यरूपः हेतुः ॥.

To this the teacher replies as follows:-

चिदात्मैव हि देवोऽन्तः स्थितमिच्छावशाद्बहिः
योगीव निरुपादानमर्थजातं प्रकाशयेत
॥6॥

योजना: चिदात्मदेव एव हि योगी इव अन्तः स्थितम् अर्थजातम् निरुपादानम् इच्छावशाद् बहिः प्रकाशयेत ॥

"That Lord, whose essential nature is sentiency, externally manifests, like a yogin all the objects which are within Him according to His free will, without (requiring) any material cause".

ननु स्वप्नादिषु स्फुटमेव उपादानादि बाह्यसामग्रीं विनैवार्थजातसिद्धिः प्रसिद्धैव ?

बाह्यसमर्पकाः = बाह्यनीलादिसंपादकाः ये हेतवः = कारणानि तेषां
- व्यतिरेकेण = अभावेनेत्यर्थः

तदाभासवैचित्र्यम् = स्वप्नोद्भूतम् - सर्वप्रमातृषु यत् असाधारण्यं तस्मात् न हि एकस्य स्वप्नादिनिष्ठमर्थजातमन्यस्य गोचरम् इति भावः

Here although in dream, remembrance, kingdome of mind and immagination etc, variety of "manifestations" the blue etc is possible, without any external cause, yet the variety of manifestations perceptible in those States, because of its impermanancy, uncommonness to all percievors and also because of its possibly being due to the residual traces, left by former expeirence, can be considered to be unreal.

यत् पुनरिदं - - - - - लोकप्रसिद्धकारभावानतिक्रमसिद्ध्यै निरूप्यते ॥

तत्र = तस्मिन् निर्माणे, उपादाने = कार्येणाभिन्ने यथा घटस्य मृत्पिण्डः

संघटिताः = आदिसर्गन्यायेन स्वयमेव मिलिताः,

आरप्स्यन्ते =

, एतत् = परमाणवो योगीच्छया इत्यादि

निरूप्येत = इत्यत्र भवद्भिरिति शेषः

कपालादिव्यवधानेन = प्रथमं कपालाद्यः संपद्यन्ते ततः ततसंधानाद् घट इति भावः॥

नियतसहकारिसमवलम्बनम् = सहकारिकारणं कार्येण भिन्नदेशं यथा घटस्य दण्डचक्रचीवरादि ॥

But in the case of various creations of city and army etc. by the simple will of a Yogin, there is no possibility of representing them to be due to different material causes, such as clay, wood, semen & blood etc. so well known to us. It cannot be said that the omnipresent atoms, brought together by the will of the Yogin, bring about the desired thing. For, the reason, why this explanation is given, is only to show, that the creation of Yogin also is due to the cause, which in its essential nature is non-different from that which we find responsible for ordinary every day creation. But this is not an established fact that the jar is the outcome of atoms alone directly. It is on the contrary, not without intervening stages of kapāla etc., that jar comes into existence; and then also it is dependent upon subsidiary causes, for instance, the movement of hands and feet, connection with certain time, place, possession of religious merit & excellence of training & practice. Thus there being so many things necessary (in the creation of jar) if a Yogin can produce only by first acquiring all that is necessary for the creation of the desired object, he would be no better than potter himself. Therefore, if the Yogins creation has after all to be without well known causes, why then think of atoms etc. as the material cause, which it is impossible to maintain.

तत्र योगिसंविद् एव .... प्रकाशयति इति = Therefore it may be admitted that such is the spiritual power of a yogie that it makes the objects, which are nothing else than the various manifestations of his spiritual power.

तत् अस्ति संभव: = Therefore it is possible.

तत् = तस्मात्.

यत् संवित् एव .... किमिति हेत्वन्तरपर्येषणा प्रयासेन खिद्यते ॥

That the universal Consciousness (संवित) whose power of freedom is acknowledged, by virtue of its peculiar will, the chief characteristic of which is freedom from obstruction, manifests these objects of the world, which are present within as one with it, objectively as "this" i.e. as external to vital air, intellect and body, to which limited power of Consciousness is given. Therefore why not admit freedom of the Sentient Self in the manifestation of the multi-farious objects of the world, which has the support of experience. Why feel the weariness, due to search for another Cause?

अप्रतिघातलक्षणात् = अप्रतिहतस्वरूपात्,

इच्छाविशेषवशात् = इच्छाविशेषसामर्थ्यात,

अनधिकात्मतया = एकतया। अनपायात् = अनाशात, संविदेकरूपत्वेन

अन्तःस्थितमेव = स्वान्तर्गतमेव सत्, मृदन्तःस्थितत्वेन व्यवह्रियमाणो हि घटो मृद्रूप स एवेति भावः

वितीर्णं = योजना

प्राणबुद्धिदेहादेः = ग्राहकत्वेनाभिमतात् प्राणादेः, परसंविदैव वितीर्णं कियन्मात्रम् = स्वविषयग्रहणमात्रसमर्थं ~~लेश~~ लेशरूपम्, संविद्रूपं यस्य तादृशात्,

बाह्यत्वेन = पृथकत्वेन, न तु परसंविदा पृथकत्वेन

पर्येषणाभि = गवेषणाभि यः प्रयासः तेन

एवकारेण इदमाह ----- इति पूर्वेण संबन्धः = The significance of the word "eva" is that all opponents have to accept the determinate illumination (व्यवस्थापनं) of the objects as the chief characteristics of Consciousness (संविद्) because, as has been already said, it is self-established (needs no proof). It Sentiency is its power of freedom, which is here indicated by the word "Deva". What is the use of unnecessary search for another Cause? Because there is this possibility that the Lord makes all manifestations, what is then the use of believing in the independent existence of the external, which lacks the support of reason. This is the connection of this verse with the previous.

Karika - 8-9.

The teacher refutes the possibility of existence of external objects by inference as follows: Inference is not possible with respect to things which have not been formerly perceived. As for the senses, they have, otherwise, been cognised to some extent (आभासितेन्द्रियत्वात् नाम), because of the cognitions of manifestations (i.e. perception) of things like seed etc, which are of the nature of cause (बीजादिहेतु वस्तुनः आभासात्). The object that is outside the light of consciousness has never become manifest (externally) in any way. Therefore, its existence cannot be proved even by inference. It is an established fact that all determinate cognitions (vikalpas), like inference, etc are based on direct perception, but with regard to external objects, we do not have the experience of a former perception and, as such, any inference with regard to external object that is based on vikalpa is impossible. We know by inference the existence of the senses, because of the perception of the objects. Just as in the case like "seed is the cause of plant" and "thread is the cause of cloth", the relation of cause and effect is to be ascertained with the help of perception & non-perception. We cannot ~~establish~~ ascertain the existence of external objects by any such means of right knowledge. Besides, the existence anything that is outside the light of consciousness, cannot be established by any means like, inference. P.T.O

The teacher therefore lays stress on the principle that everything external indwells in the Self. He says, the mass of the so-called objects is manifested only as resting within the Lord (Self). Without that there will be no rise of will, which is a kind of the determinate consciousness (ज्ञानेच्छा:) i.e. the first conscious activity to make externally manifest the objects from within. The process of creation or emanation from the Lord follows the illustration of potter who proceeds producing externally pots etc., from his reflective desire. And the act of creation is not possible without the reflective desire on the part of the Lord.

संभावनानुमानम् = तर्करूपमनुमानम् = दृढमनुमानम् = बाह्याभिमतम् = बाह्यत्वेनाभिमतम्

ननु ए------- हेतुभावेन ब्रूयाम ? उभयथा = बाह्य- अनुमेयबाध्युक्तप्रकारेण समनन्तरश्लोकोक्तप्रकारेण च ॥

एवम् = वक्ष्यमाणम् , उभयथा = बाह्यानुमेयबाध्युक्तप्रकारेण समनन्तर-श्लोकोक्तप्रकारेण,

संभावनानुमानम् = तर्करूपमनुमानम्, न तु दृढमनुमानम्,

बाह्याभिमतम् = बाह्यत्वेनाभिमतम्, सांशयिकम् = संशयग्रस्तम् ॥

There are two ways in which the external phenomenon can be explained by inference. Well then (i) should we follow the analogy of a jar etc reflected in a mirror, in the case of appearance of variety of reflection in the light of consciousness (ज्ञान) and suppose some external objects as the causes of variety, different from the mirror of विज्ञान: (ii) or should we follow the Samvid to be the only cause. This is doubtful. Therefore, the Author refutes the possibility of inference of external objects in the following two verses:-

अनुमानमनाभातपूर्वे नैवेष्टमिन्द्रियम् ।
आभातमेव बीजादेराभासाद्धेतुवस्तुनः ॥८॥

आभासः पुनराभासाद्बाह्यस्यासीत्कथंचन ।
अर्थस्य नैव तेनास्य सिद्धिर्नाप्यनुमानतः ॥९॥

योजना :- अनाभातपूर्वे (वस्तुनि) अनुमानं नैव इष्टम्, इन्द्रियम् आभातमेव (किंचिदुपलब्धः कारणम् - अर्थात् - अनुमीयते किंचिद्मात्रनिमित्त), (कुतः) बीजादेः हेतुवस्तुनः आभासात्

पुनः आभासाद् (चिदात्मप्रकाशाद्) बाह्यस्य अर्थस्य आभासः (बाह्यस्य आभासस्य आभासनम्) कथंचन नैव आसीत, तेन अस्य (अर्थस्य) सिद्धिः अनुमानतः अपि न (आसीत) ॥

another version :– Pandey. "According to none, inference is possible of things which have not been directly perceived. As for the senses, they have of course been cognised, because of the cognition of things such as seed etc which are of the nature of cause."

Eng :- 8.

(The teacher says:) Inference is not possible with respect to things which have not been previously percieved (अनुआभातपूर्वे). As for the senses, they have of course been cognised (as cause of external objects) to some extent (आभातम् एव किंचिद् मात्रम्) because of the cognitions of manifestations (i.e. perceptions) of things like seed etc, which are (recognised to be) of the nature of cause

(बीजादेः हेतुवस्तुनः आभासात्).

9. Eng :

(The teacher further says:) There has never been, in any way, the manifestation of the object that is outside the light of consciousness (आभासात् बाह्यस्य आभासः कथं च नैव आसीत) i.e, the object that is outside the light of consciousness never becomes manifest (externally) in any way. Therefore, the existence cannot be proved even by inference (तेन अस्या अर्थस्य सिद्धि अनुमानता अपि न).

Pande version: "The object that is outside the light of consciousness has never shone in any way. Therefore its existence cannot be established even by inference."

अनन्तरश्लोक = "चिदात्मैव हि" इति, तत्र निर्दिष्टाभि = उक्ताभि; योगिदृष्टान्तादिरूपाभिः,
युक्तिभिः = उपायैः

Because of the arguments, stated in the preceding verses the external objects do not shine as the objects of perception (4-5):

प्रत्यक्षेण बाह्योऽर्थो न आभासते = अनुमाने न बाह्यार्थो नावभासते यावत् प्रत्यक्षेणापि भासते,

इयदेव हि प्रत्यक्षं = For, what is after all perception? –

यत नीले भाति = Is it not only this "Nila shines"

इति स्वप्रकाशाद्रूपं = And it is non-different from Self manifest light of consciousness (संवित्).

नाधिकं किञ्चित् इति = It is nothing more

? यावत् .... इति अपि शब्दः = Not only this; but this external cannot be established by inference also. This is the force of "अपि".

प्रकृतसिद्धिम् = बाह्यासिद्धिम्

तत्र अनुमानम् ...... उत्सहते = Here the inference cannot apply.

प्रवृत्तमपि .... दर्शयति = And even if it does, it cannot establish the existence of External things (प्रकृतसिद्धिमप्रदर्श्यात्).

And this is what is tried to be proved by these two verses.

अनुमानं-विकल्पः = अनुमानम् विकल्पो भवति न निर्विकल्पदर्शनम् अवसायमात्रहेतुत्वात् -

Inference is a kind of determinate knowledge

सर्वे = अनुमानादि-रूपः

सर्वश्च अयं विकल्पोऽनुभूत भवमूल इति प्रसिद्धम् = But all determinate ~~knowledge~~ cognitions are due to direct perception (experience). This is well known.

सर्वः = अनुमानादिरूपः, अनुभवमूलः = निर्विकल्पज्ञानमूलः

तत्र = अननुभूतचरे

तेन = अनुमानस्य विकल्पत्वेन .... इष्यते = Therefore nobody can say that inference can operate in relation to those things which have never been the object of ~~experience~~ of direct experience.

[illegible] – ननु ...... संकथा इयम् = But if you say that the above statement holds good in the case of inference concerning those things which have been the objects of direct perception;

इयं संकथा = अनुभूतचरत्व-संकथा।

किंवदन्ति = तत्र सामान्यतो दृष्टात् व्याप्तिग्रहण संभवनात् ततदन्यथेति भावः॥

सामान्यतो .... इन्द्रियानुमाने ? = But it cannot be true in those cases in which inference is applied to the things, of which there has been only generic perception (सामान्यतो दृष्टे) as in the case of inference of senses, because of the perception of the objects.

कुत्र तत्सामान्यतो दृष्टमनुमाने भवतीत्याह 'यथा' →

इत्यत = Our reply is as follows:-

→ अर्थोपलब्ध्या = घटादिविषयेण ज्ञानेन,

सर्वदाऽतीत ← इन्द्रियानुमाने = इन्द्रियमपि पूर्वानुभूतमेव, न हि तत्प्रातिस्विकेन
इन्द्रिय चक्षुरा द्यनु- आकारेणानुमीयते अपि तु सामान्येन।
माने

तत्रापि = इन्द्रियानुमानादिरूपे सामान्यतो दृष्टेऽपि

सोऽर्थः = चक्षरादिरूपः विषयः, स्पृश्यते = प्रकाश्यते,
सामान्यभावेन अनुभूयते

स्थितिः = व्यवस्था

It is admitted that in the case of inference based on generic perception also, the inferred object is to be of the same type as the one which was object of determinate cognition

विकल्पश्च = विकल्प से, सन्निवेशविशेषादिना = रचना-
विशेषादिना,

विशेषात्मना = विशेषस्वरूपेण

पुनः केन रूपेण स्पृशतीत्यत आह — 'अपि तु' इति

किंचिदुपलब्धे कारणे भवति, इत्यमुना स्वभावेन =
सामान्यरूपेणेत्यर्थः॥

The determinate cognition (inference) however does not come into touch with senses etc as possessed of any particular form, but simply as some cause of perception.

स च स्वभावः = स्पष्टीक स्पष्टीविषयीकृत स्वभावश्च

कारणतालक्षणः = कारणतास्वरूपः; धर्मरूपः

प्रत्यक्षागृहीत एव : ....

Now this characteristic, namely the causality is of course directly perceived.

तथा च .... यावत् तावत् निश्चयः =

प्रत्यक्षानुपलम्भबलेन = प्रत्यक्षानुपलम्भौ हि कार्यकारणभावं
साधयतः, तत्र प्रत्यक्षं प्रत्याभासं प्रमाणम्
अनुपलम्भोऽपि अन्योपलम्भस्वभावत्वादेवेति॥

प्रत्याभासम् = सर्वेष्वाभासेषु, प्रामाण्यम् = प्रमाणताम्,

For instance seed is the cause of sprout, and thread is the cause of cloth, the relation of cause and the effect is to be ascertained with the help of perception and non-perception.

तत्र = प्रत्यक्षानुपलंभयोर्मध्ये, सर्वेष्वाभासेषु प्रमाणताम भजते

विमर्शलक्षणस्य = विकल्प ज्ञान रूपस्य,

एकैकशब्दवाच्ये = एकैकशब्दाभिधेयसमस्त धर्मधर्मिसमुदाय रूपे, स्वलक्षणे इति यावत

प्रवृत्तेः, न तु निर्विकल्पदर्शनवत् प्रत्याभास प्रवृत्तेः,

तदनुसारित्वाच्च = विमर्शानुसारित्वाच्च, प्रमाणस्यः प्रत्यक्षादेरित्यर्थः

एकाभिधान विषये = तत्र हि स्वोत्पादित विकल्पद्वारेणैव प्रमाणस्य स्वलक्षणविषयत्वं कथयिष्यति

Of the two (means of right knowledge) the perception operates on each limited manifestation separately because the mental re-action (विमर्शः) which is nothing but determinative cognitive activity, refers to the object, for which a single expression stands and because the means of indeterminate cognition follows the same line as does that of determinate one. This point will be asserted as follows:-

"The uncontradicted cognition refers to the object, for which a single expression stands" -

इति आभासमात्रं च सामान्यम् इति निर्णेष्यते = It shall be proved later that "Abhāsa" as such is universal.

अनुपलम्भोऽपि ------ विश्रान्त एव = As for Anuplambha, that also is essentially nothing more than the perception of another thing & depends upon the Abhāsa as such.

आभासमात्रम् = केवलः आभासः, न तु सर्वधर्माक्षेपेण ग्रहणम्

अनुपलंभः = गोत्वस्यत्वानुपलंभः,

अन्योपलंभरूपः = अश्वादिष्वत्वाद्युपलंभरूपः, प्रमाता हि गोषु गोत्वं प्रत्यक्षेण पश्यन् अश्वादिषु तदनुपलभमानः सर्वगोव्यक्तिगतं गोत्वं निश्चिनोति ।

आभासमात्रविश्रान्त एव = न तु पराभिमतव्यक्तिविश्रान्तः

अत एव हेतु ~ कारणाभासः = इन्द्रियगतः उपलब्धिकारणताभासः

विशेषशून्यः = तन्निष्ठुतयाऽग्रहणात् विशेषरहितः -

परिगृहीतः = प्रत्यक्षानुपलंभाभ्यामिति शेषः

बीजात् -------- आभासात् = Therefore in the case of cognition of causal relation between seed and sprout, there has already been generic cognition of causal relation i.e. that which necessarily presupposes something for its own being is the effect of the presupposed. For in the case of every jar its having a cause as such in the form of clay etc shines.

"बीजात्" इति, स्फुटमेव हि बीजस्याङ्कुरं प्रति कारणत्वम् इति भावः)

नियमम् = अवश्यंभावम्, ~~अ~~ मृत्तिकादिरूपः = मृद्दण्डादिरूपः यो हेतुस्तेन

आभासात् = स्फुरणात् ॥-

...ण विरुद्धतासाधनं ताह ग्रामबाह्यस्य वस्तु... तस्याः विरुद्ध-
त्वमापद्येतेत्यत आह "ग्राम" इति

(9). अस्यार्थ आभासात् बाह्यः .... विप्रतिषिद्धम् =

विप्रतिषिद्धम् = विरुद्धम्, It is contradictory to say that, that which is outside the light of Consciousness and is i.e. itself different from the light; shines.

अनाभाते च नास्ति .... व्यापारः = And in the case of that which does not shine, the inference, which is of the nature of determinate knowledge, does not operate.

⊕ ग्रामगृहादेस्तु .... एतत् न वस्तुसाम्यम् ॥

तद् = ग्रामबाह्यम् In the case of the statement "Out of the village" or वस्तु - "Out of the house", for in that case, the road, garden जातम् tank, ditch and scale etc, shall have to be considered सन्निकटम् = as different in their essential nature from village or ग्रामसमीपस्थम् house. In all such cases "Out" (Bāhya) simply उच्यते ॥ means "near". Therefore, in "Out of village" & "Out of light" there is only similarity of words & not of meaning.

एवं ये विकल्पे .... न बाह्ये उपपन्नः = Thus even according to those (Bauddhas) who hold that the thing does not shine in determinate cognition the use of inference is not ~~possible~~ justifiable in the case of the external.

अस्माभिस्तु .... इति सूत्रे = As for ourselves we have already stated our view in the verse "If the determinate cognition be error", the determinative activity of cognition has also its object, that shine

तेन अनुमानविकल्पात्मानि .... एव स्यात् = Therefore if the external objects, blue etc are not illuminated by the light of inference, which is a determinate cognition, then it cannot be represented to be inferred at all.

अथ भाति एव .... न बाह्यः = But if it be admitted to be illuminated, then according to the rule, "which is not light cannot be brought to light", it shall have to be admitted to be "light" in its essential nature. It is not external.

अध्यवसायस्य = विकल्पकार्यस्याध्यवसानस्य,
आभासमानविषयत्वम् = अर्थविषयत्वम्,
अनुमानविकल्पात्मना = अनुमानरूपविकल्परूपतां
"साधयति" = "प्रागिवार्थोऽप्रकाशः" इति न्यायेन गतेन,

तेन बाह्ये साध्ये .... इति विरुद्धमेव = Therefore all the arguments, which are adduced to establish the external, prove on the contrary, the internality of the so called external.

अत एव आह "कथंचन" इति ..... अभूत इति. Therefore the author uses the words "in any way" i.e whether perceptibly or inferably, the external, which is not light, never shone.

तस्मात् ...... "हि देव" इति = It is consequently established that the Sentient Lord Himself is the manifester.

ननु .... इति आशङ्क्य आह :-

It has been said that He manifests externally what is present within. But how do you establish the presence of all within Him? To this the teacher replies as follows:-

स्वामिनश्चात्मसंस्थस्य भावजातस्य भासनम्
अस्त्येव न विना तस्मादिच्छामर्शः प्रवर्तते ॥२०॥

योजना :- स्वामिनः आत्मसंस्थस्य एव (आत्मनीवाभेदेन वर्तमानस्य) भावजातस्य भासनमस्ति, तस्माद्विना इच्छामर्शः न प्रवर्तते निर्विषयत्वात् ॥

The teacher says; The mass of the so called objects is manifested only as resting within the Lord (Self). Without that there cannot be the rise of will, which is a kind of the determinate consciousness (आमर्शः) i.e. the first conscious activity in the process of making externally manifest the objects from within.

बहीरूपतया आभासनेऽपि बहीरूपतयापि .... "प्रमात्रैकात्म्यान्तर्यते" इति

(margin: बहीरूपतया आभासनेऽपि — इदन्तया ग्रहणेऽपीति ॥)

Even when things are manifest externally their internality does not get broken. For, internality is nothing else than "Oneness with the (highest) ~~Sub~~ Subject". This shall be stated later on. And this oneness of things is always there, because that which is not one with light, and therefore does not shine, is nothing.

प्रमात्रैकात्म्यम् = प्रमात्रा सह प्रकाशेन सह – ऐकात्म्यम्-

तत् च = भावानां प्रमात्रा सह एकात्म्यं च,

तदात्मतया = प्रकाशरूप प्रमातृरूपतया,

अप्रकाशमानस्य = "प्रागिवार्थः" इति न्यायेन प्रकाशाकर्तृत्वम् भजतो भावजातस्य,

अवस्तुत्वात् = अप्रकाशमाने हि वस्तु वस्तु न भवति,

तत्र = तस्मिन भावजाते

सैव = इदन्ता परामर्श एव,

न तु ततो निर्गत्य बहिरवस्थानम्

व्यवहाराः संकीर्येरन् = सङ्करं गच्छेयुः

किन्तु .... बहुधा परामर्शनम् = But externality consists in "this" consciousness where rightly there should be "I" consciousness. Thus according to this system, resting nothing is nothing else than consciousness of the objective as "I" and not as "this", a form which befits the sentient (Cit).

तत् च = अहमिति परामर्शने च,

तत् च .... व्यवहाराः =

Such as consciousness of objects, rile etc there is. We cannot say 'it is not'. For, in that case the consciousness 'Let me make a jar" which is called desire in relation to the act, about to be done, or on the part of the potter, for instance, not being restricted or limited by the object of desire, why should it not have reference to cloth? Thus, confusion in transaction should follow.

अथ तत्रापि .... नोपपन्नम् इति =

But if one were to say that in the case of desire also, the jar, having been created (in imagination) at the very time of desire,

इति कथं? कुंभकृतः — कुंभनिर्माणे उद्युक्तस्य कुलालस्य

उत्तर क्रियामपेक्ष्य ~~इच्छाशब्दवाच्यः तां प्रति इच्छारूपः~~ इतिवाक्
"घटं करवाणि" इति परामर्शः भवति।

सः, एषणीयेन — एषणाविषयभूतेन, अत एव
परामृश्येन — इच्छारूपस्य परामर्शस्यापि विषयभूतेन
घटेन

अनियन्त्रतः = विकल्पभावेन परिच्छिन्नतां
न नीत एवेत्स्यात् —

ततः सा = परामर्शरूपा इच्छा — घटेच्छापि
कथं न स्यात्

अथ = यदि   तत्रापि = तस्यां घटेच्छायाम
अपि,

एषणीयः तदानीम = इच्छासमये
निमितः = संपादितः, सन् तथा जातः →
एषणीयः सम्पन्नः

तर्हि = तस्य - घटस्य निर्माणम्
चिदात्मनि = चित्स्वरूपे,
इच्छया विना उपपन्नं न भवति —

अतश्चेच्छान्तरम् = निर्मीयमाणविषया
अन्या इच्छा

अनवस्था... = तत्राप्यन्य एषणीयः तत्राप्यन्या
इच्छा इत्येवंरूपः अनवस्था दोषो
भवेत्।

P.T.O.

अयम् = पुरोभासमानः, सततम् अवभासुरे वपुषीस्य तादृश्यम्,

संवित् = प्रकाशरूपं परप्रमातृतत्त्वम् ।

एनम् = अहन्तया स्थितं भावराशिम्,

बहिःकरोति = इदन्तया भासयति, ऐक्येन स्थितं सत् अपोहनशक्त्या भेदेन भासयति

कथम् → प्रमातृणाम् — ग्राहकरूपाणां स्वांश-भूतानां मितप्रमातृणां यत्प्रथनम् — अपोहनशक्त्या स्वतो भेदेन भासनम् तत् पूर्वं यत्र तत्, प्रथमं ग्राहकान् भासयति तदनन्तरं ग्राह्यवर्गमिति भावः ॥

तत्रापि = बहिष्करणेऽपि

has become its object, then we would say that creation (i.e. imagination) in the case of sentient being is not reasonable without a preceding desire

इत्यत्र वर्णयिष्यते = This point shall be explained later on in "Such a desire of one who desires to sit is Causality".

ततश्च इच्छा-तस्यापि ...... अनवस्था = If therefore another desire also were to be assumed, the question will again be "is that associationed with object or not? & so on ad-infinitum.

विषयनियन्त्रिते चेत .... स्यात = But if it is said that it is associated with an object then the object is identical with Self but if not, why then the desire to create on the part of the potter should not refer to cloth?

अथ तत्रापि .... प्रमातृभिदप्रथनपूर्वकम् =

If there also immediate imaginary creation be supposed, then again अनवस्था will result. Therefore it has to be admitted that the whole of this mass of external things is ever shining in the sentient Self as "I" and that universal Consciousness (संवित्) in a certain order or even without it manifests them externally in multifarious forms, because of its omnipotence, the chief characteristic of which is freedom. The manifestation

of subject precedes that of object.

तत्रापि क्वचित् .... प्रेक्षकान् =

In this variety of manifestations also Samvid makes the perceivers one in relation to certain manifestations, i.e. it makes the spectators one in relation to certain the dance of a heavy hipped dancing woman. For they become one in relation to that particular manifestation (dance) only.

शरीर प्राणबुद्धि .... न सर्वथा ऐक्यम् = There identity however is not complete because the idea of difference, associated with body, vital air, intellect and pleasure etc, which constitute parts (of universal manifestation) still persists.

"एत एव .... प्रपञ्चयति = There fore the highest Lord by uniting the perceivers or separating them manifests the universe in diverse ways such as creation, destruction etc.

"मुहुर्मुहुर .... "

All praise to the indescribable, timeless & unborn one, who remains indeterminate even though by His determinate countless imagining He is ever creating all the three worlds.

तेन विना .... = for otherwise there would no possibility of desire for them.

"प्रथमत्र संक्षेपः = स्वामिनः — विमर्शात्मैश्वर्ययुक्तात् ~~प्रमा~~ प्रभवाकारन-रूपात् चित् तत्त्वात्, आत्मसंस्थस्य = तदात्म्येन स्वान्तर्गतस्यैव सतः, भावजातस्य = भावराशेः, भासनमस्ति, तस्मात् विना = समवस्थानं विना, इच्छामर्शः — 'करवाणि' इति इच्छारूपो विमर्शो न प्रवर्तेत निर्विषयत्वात् ॥

ननु परामर्शो नाम विकल्पः, स च अविकल्पशुद्धसंविद्रूपे भगवति कथं स्यात् इत्याशङ्क्याह:-.

But desire implies determinacy and how is that possible in the Lord, who is of the nature of pure Consciousness, which is free from all determinacy (avikalpa)? To this the teacher replies as follows:-

स्वभावमवभासस्य विमर्शं विदुरन्यथा ।
प्रकाशोऽर्थोपरक्तोऽपि स्फटिकादिजडोपमः
॥११॥

योजना: अवभासस्य (आत्मप्रकाशस्य) स्वभावम् (मुख्यं रूपम्) विमर्शं विदुः, अन्यथा अर्थ-उपरक्तोऽपि प्रकाशः स्फटिकादि जडोपमः (स्यात्) ॥

Eng: It is known (विदुः) that Sentiency or freedom of Consciousness (विमर्शः) is the very nature of the light of Consciousness (of the Subject). For otherwise, though reflection of the external objects be falling upon it, yet it would be no better than insentient crystal etc."

इह अवभासस्य .... वैलक्षण्यम् = Here if both the light of Consciousness or prakasha & what is different from it ie non-manifest eg jar etc, exist in mutual isolation & rest within themselves, it would be impossible to point one out as sentient as distinct from the other, which is insentient, as in the case of jar and cloth (independently of the light of Consciousness

अथ अवभासो .... अजडा स्यात् ॥ But if it were to be said that the light sentient, because it is connected with the object; (the reply is that if mere relation with something be sufficient to call a thing sentient) why then not call clay also sentient because of its connection with jar?

अथ न स्वसंबन्धमात्रम् ...... समापतितम् = But if it is not only connection with the objects but also making them manifest (that constitutes sentiency) then it follows that light of consciousness is manifest as object.

न च अन्यात्मना .... उपपन्नः = For it is not reasonable to hold that one who is essentially different from the other is the manifester of it.

अथ अन्य स्वभावोऽपि .... इति घटोऽपि अजडः स्यात् = But if jar, though different in its nature from light of consciousness be supposed to be the cause of light (i.e. its shining as related to jar) then light also being the cause (manifestation of) jar (as such) the jar also shall have to be admitted to be sentient.

अथ अन्येनापि सता .... घटस्य इति उच्यते = ततश्च अजडः
But if the light of consciousness is to be supposed to be sentient, because jar, though it is different from light of consciousness, yet it casts reflection on the light, bearing which light is called light of jar

~~तत्स्व~~ तर्हि ~~स~~ स्फटिक सलिलम् .... अजड एव स्यात्॥
then crystal, water and mirror also, being simi-lar, Shall have to be admitted to be Sentient.

अथ तथा भूत~~मस्वच्~~ मपि - : ... इति जडः ~~.........~~ ~~इत्य~~....
अनन्यमुखप्रेक्षात्वं नाम् = But if it were Said that as crystal etc are not able to feel Consciousness of their being affected with reflection, so they are insentient, then it follows that Consciousness of being affected with reflection, which is the very life of Sentiency, the essential nature of which is free-dom in respect of with-drawing within & spreading out, is natural to prakasha.

अहमेवं .... काङ्क्षति = That is what is known as perfect Independence, the chief characteristic of which is resting within ones' own Self. For, when the Consciousness "I alone, whose an essentially light, am Shining" rises, then Samvid Considers it Self to be the Knower, the Known and the means of Knowledge & and does not require any other, the So Called external thing (for having Such Consciousness). But So far as crys-tal etc concerned, even when reflection is falling on
अहेवं प्रकाशात्मा = अहमेव प्रकाशात्मना स्वप्रकाशस्वभावेन च,
स्वसंविदेव = स्वरूपभूता संविदेव न तु ततो ~~वि~~ व्यतिरिक्तं किंचिद्
आदि शब्देन प्रमाग्रहणम्, चरितार्थम् = कृतार्थं. वस्तु.
अभिमन्यते सः प्रमाता,
अतिरिक्तम् - स्वरूपभूतसंविदः व्यतिरिक्तं प्रमात्रादि चरितार्थं न काङ्क्षति.

सर्वं तु .... पूर्वापरकोट्योः॥.
All things, both before and after their Separate

> * then, to be known as such they require a subject, diffe-rent from them and there-fore, because of their being devoid of Consciousness they are insen-tient -

manifestation, are in reality sentient, because they rest in Self-Consciousness; because they are one with Self-consciousness, which is the essential nature of the Subject.

← वस्तुतः = परमार्थतः, सर्वत्र विमर्शात्मकः - उक्तन्यायेन विमर्शस्वभावः यः प्रमातृस्वभावः, प्रकाशरूपः परप्रमातृस्वभावः तेन सह यत्तादात्म्यम् — प्रकाशमानत्वान्यथाऽनुपपत्त्या एकत्वम्, तेन या अहंपरामर्शे विश्रान्तिः तस्याः हेतोः, पूर्वापरकोट्योः = ग्रहणेच्छासमये ग्रहणानन्तरं च, अजडत्वमेव = प्रकाशस्वरूपत्वमेव भवति:

"इदमित्यस्य .... सोऽहमित्ययम्"

"The fruition (culminating point) of the distinct determinate Cognition "this" consists in its resting on what constitutes its essential nature; and that is the determinate Consciousness "I am that".

मध्यावस्थैव तु .... इति स्थितम् ॥

The middle state only, which is characterised by "this" and in which both the former & the later states are not apprehended*, is the Sphere of Maya, the Samsara of the Ignorant. Therefore it is established that Sentient freedom is the only essential Characteristic of Lord.

* यद्यपि परमार्थतः ग्राहकत्वावच्छिन्नप्रकाशैकैवैतत्सिद्धम्, अन्यथा तद्द्वारेण तस्याः [illegible] ... सिद्धमेव, परन्तु [illegible] अतिसूक्ष्मतया तत्साक्षात् कथितम्, अतएव स्वात्म परामर्शे शुद्धप्रकाशस्यापीयमेव वैतन्यं सूक्ष्म-[illegible] "[illegible]"

विमर्श = घटापरक्त प्रकाश प्रकाशरूपनिजस्वरूपरूप विषयः उपरागकारि घटविषयश्च परामर्श एव ।

प्रधानम् = स्वरूपस्य ~~प्रकाश~~ प्रकाशतोपपादकत्वेन मुख्यम्, स्वरूपमपि मुख्यमिति भावः ।

स्थितम् = सिद्धम् भवति । तथा च प्रकाशगतविश्रान्तिः न सिध्यति ॥ *.

Eng:- ...the Self is distinct from the insentient; therefore, it is spoken of as Sentiency (चैतन्यं), the implied sense of which is the sentient activity or freedom in respect of conscious activity."

न केवलं .... इति दर्शयति ॥

It is not that we alone have represented the sentient freedom to be the chief characteristic of Samvid, other Agmas also have done the same. The Author says:-.

*आत्मात एव चैतन्यं चित्क्रिया चितिकर्तृता।
तात्पर्येणोदितस्तेन जडात्स हि विलक्षणः ॥१२॥

(आत्म् अतएव = यतः)

योजना :- अत एव आत्मा चैतन्यं, (चैतन्यं) चित्क्रिया (चेतन-क्रिया), चितिकर्तृता (स्वातन्त्र्यं ...... चितावेव), (तत्) तात्पर्येण उदितः (उक्तः); तेन (चैतन्येन) स जडात् विलक्षणः हि ॥.

आत्मनो रूपम् = प्रकाशरूपस्य अवभासाख्यस्य प्रमातृतत्त्वस्य
अमुम् = विमर्शस्य आत्मनः प्रधानरूपतारूपम् | तत इति शेषः स्वभावः ॥
प्रयोजनरूपम् = प्रयोजकतया प्रयोजनस्वरूपम् :
धर्मिस्वभावः = चैतन्याख्यस्य धर्मस्य आश्रयत्वेन धर्मिस्वरूपः

Because free consciousness (विमर्श) is the chief characteristic of Self; therefore to represent it as such, the Self though a substance and substratum of attributes, is put in the same case as that of Sentiency (चैतन्य) though the latter stands for an attribute, in the Shiv Sutra, "चैतन्यमात्मा" by the glorious one. *

(आत्मनः = प्रकाशरूपस्य, प्रमातृतत्त्वस्य रूपम् = स्वभावः, तत इति शेषः, अमुम् = विमर्श-स्वम् आत्मनः प्रधानरूपता-रूपम्,)

चित् चितिशक्तिरपरिणामिनी = आत्मा भवति,
(प्रयोजनरूपम् = प्रयोजकतया प्रयोजनस्वरूपम्,) तद् दृशेः = आत्मरूपायाः दृशेः, कैवल्यम् = औदासीन्यं भवति,
दृष्टा दृशिमात्रा भवति इति सूत्रत्रयस्यार्थः ॥

धर्मिस्वभावः = चैतन्याख्यस्य धर्मस्य आश्रयत्वेन धर्मिस्वरूपः ॥

धर्मशब्देन = "चितिशक्तिरपरिणामिनी" इत्यादिना,

अनन्तेन = शेषेण, | ननु तर्हि आत्मनः अप्रधानत्वम् पराश्रितो

हि धर्मः स्फुटमप्रधानमेवेत्यत आह "द्रव्यं" इति

द्रव्यम् = गुणाश्रयः, प्रधानं वस्तु इति यावत्, न तु तार्किका-

अभिमतद्रव्येष्विव गुणकर्मादिरूपः पदार्थवर्गापेक्षी:"

भाति = घट इव मृदि स्फुरति, पुनः कीदृशो भवतीत्यपेक्षायाम् आह।

"अर्थ्यते च" इति, जनैः अर्थक्रियार्थे = निजनिजार्थार्थ-

क्रियार्थम्, प्रार्थ्यते च, न हि मृदोऽनिष्कृष्टो घटः उदका-

हरणार्थं केनापि प्रार्थ्यते ॥

भूतानि = महाभूतानि, भावाः = भौतिकानि, धर्माः = आश्रिता-

आश्रयाः = धर्मिणः तद्भूतानि पदार्थान्तराणि च तानि, एव,

स्वभावः = स्वरूपं यस्य तादृशा, समस्तधर्मधर्मिरूपः,

तामेव = अर्थरूपां संविदमेव,

मुख्यद्रव्यस्वरूपाम् = सर्वाश्रयत्वेन प्रधानद्रव्यरूपाम्

सर्वे = संविदेव, धर्मशब्देन सकलभावजातमेव उक्तम्

∴ The word "Sentiency" (चैतन्यः) stands for any word, which means the essential characteristic (of Self). For the teacher (Patañjali) in (i) "The power of Sentiency is unchanging" (ii) "That is the perfect isolation (Kaivalya) of Consciousness (Dṛsi). and (iii) "The Subject is nothing more than the Consciousness", has put the Self in the same case as that of the word, which stands for essential nature. The Substance is that, resting on which every-thing shines & is desired for practical purposes. Therefore, if you do not get angry (I would say that) the entire mass of Categories, elements, objects & words shine

as such only resting on universal Consciousness (Samvid) and because this mass, including the Categories, such as quality, action etc, essential nature & such other Categories as are the Substrata, rests on that Samvid which is the most important of all of Substances, therefore that (Samvid) alone is the true Substance. *;

कर्तृकृन्दौ ति .... अंशः प्रत्यायितो भवति =

कृर्तृकृदन्तात् = "कर्तरि कृत्" इति सूत्रेण चेतयतीति कर्तरि विहितः यः कृत्प्रत्ययः "युच्" प्रत्ययः सः अन्ते यस्य, तादृशात् प्रातिपदिकात्, भावे विहितेन ष्यञा,

संबन्धम् = धर्मधार्मिभावम्, प्राधान्येन = आत्मस्वरूपत्वेन, भावो हि स्वरूपमेव. दर्शिताः,

संबन्ध संबन्धिनो विश्रान्तस्य संबन्धिविश्रान्तस्य, द्रव्यरूपस्य = चेतनाख्यधर्मिरूपस्य,

प्रकृत्या = चित्याख्यधातुप्रकृत्या, "चितिक्रियारूपम्" →

धर्मम् = चितिक्रियाख्यम्, संबद्धम् = चेतनेन संबन्धयुक्तं

अवगमयता = भावे विहितत्वेन सूचयता, ष्यञा = ष्यञ प्रत्ययेन,

निष्कृष्टांशः = चितिक्रियारूपः चेतनात् प्रथक्कृतो भाग;

प्रत्यायितो भवति = बोधितः स्यात् ॥

चितिक्रिया च .... चितौ क कर्तृता = चेतनाख्यात् द्रव्यात् ष्यञा निष्कृष्टा चित्याख्या क्रिया च, चितौ = चेतयतीत कर्तृ प्रत्ययान्त चितिशब्दवाच्ये चेतने स्थिता, कर्तृता = क्रियाश्रय एव हि कर्ता कर्ता भवति

जडवत् आत्ममात्रतायामविश्रान्तत्वम् = जडन्यायेन स्वरूपमात्रे स्थित्यभावः, स्वं प्रति परान् प्रति च ग्राहकत्वमिति यावत्.

"चित्क्रियाचितिकर्तृतातात्पर्येण" = अथ चित क्रिया एव चितिकर्तृत्व-चितौ कर्तृता, तस्याः यत्तात्पर्यं तेन, चित् क्रियैव चिति-कर्तृता यथा ज्ञायते इत्याभिप्रायेणेत्यर्थः-

तदेव = अहंरूपचितिकर्तृत्वमेव,

वैलक्षण्यादापि = आत्मभेदकारि, तेष्वहंपरामर्शासंभवादिति भावः

परत्वेन = एतत् निष्ठत्वेन, अभिसन्धाय = चेतसि कृत्वा,

धर्मान्तराधरीकरणाय = नित्यत्वाद्यन्यधर्मगौणीभावआपादनाय,

विमर्शधर्मोद्धुरीकरणाय च = अहं विमर्शमुख्यीकरणाय च

*1 The word "Chaitanya" is formed by adding the ~~(Taddiha)~~ (Taddhita) afix, expressive of the state of being (ṣyañ) which indicates relation, to the word "Cetana", formed by adding Kṛdanta afix (Lyuṭ) expressive of the sense of doer.

Therefore the word "Caitanya" sentiency has been prominently represented to be the most essential nature of Samvid, which is the substratum of the mass of innumerable qualities. A relation is always experienced as resting on the two, which are related, as one of the related, the substance, is referred to by the original form (Cetana); So the affix "ṣyañ", which indicates that the essential nature (Dharma), namely the consciousness, as an activity, is related, brings to light

the remaining (of the two which are related, namely Consciousness, as an activity). And activity in Consciousness is nothing more than the agential activity i.e. freedom in uniting, separating & holding together. It consists of not being self-confined, like the insentient; in having as its essential nature unlimited light, in perfect independence of others. And this freedom constitutes the point of distinction of the Self from the insentient, which are devoid of power of freedom to conjoin & disjoin. Having that (power of freedom) in his mind as all-surpassing & most prominent, in order to indicate the subordination of other attributes and superiority of free Consciousness, the Author instead of saying, "Self is sentient" says "Self is sentiency" (चितिक्रिया चितिकर्तृता तात्पर्येण) is one compound (समासः). For, the rule "every quarter of a verse should be self contained" is applicable to poetry and not to philosophy. Or they may be taken separately as follows:-

The act of Consciousness or the characteristic feature of the agent in the act of Consciousness is spoken of as Self. This is an interpretation which is not found anywhere.

,,अत्रायं संक्षेपः = अत एव – स्वभासस्य विमर्शस्वभावत्वादेव, चितिक्रियाचिति कर्तृता तात्पर्येण हेतुना आत्मा चैतन्यमुदितः – "चैतन्यमात्मा" इति सूत्रे श्लोकेन

उभयम् = युगलकम्, स्वात्मनि स्थितं न तु अन्योन्यं प्रति वैलक्षण्यापादकं भवति निर्विकल्पत्वात् भेदापादनस्य च विकल्पकार्यत्वात्, "तद्बुद्धिमर्शोऽपि अविमर्शोऽपि च" इति उभयं च स्वात्मनि स्यात, अ इति = अत: कारणात्, → कथं निमर्श-युगलकेनापि, जडाजडयोर्वैलक्ष्यण्यम् ॥

But just as 'light' and 'not light' are in themselves so; (because they are indeterminate) and, therefore, when the word 'light' is used it does not necessarily indicate that (what is referred to by) it is distinct from in-sentient: so Vimarsha (free Consciousness) + a-Vimarsha - in sentiency (or sentiency) are also in themselves. Therefore, they (the words representing them) also cannot necessarily mean any distinction between the sentient & the insentient. With the object in mind the Author says:--

चितिः प्रत्यवमर्शात्मा परा वाक्स्वरसोदिता।
स्वातन्त्र्यमेतन्मुख्यं तदैश्वर्यं परमात्मनः ॥१३॥

योजना: चितिः प्रत्यवमर्शात्मा (प्रत्यवमर्श:- स्वात्म चमत्कार-लक्षण आत्मा-स्वभाव:, विमर्शो हि सर्वं सह: परमपि आत्मी करोति, आत्मानं च परीकरोति ------) परा (पूर्णत्वात् परा) वाक् (वक्ति विश्वम् अभिलपति प्रत्यवमर्शेन इति च वाक्) स्वरसोदिता (स्वरसेन चिद्रूपतया अनस्तमिता - सदोदिता), एतत् स्वातन्त्र्यं तत् परमात्मनः मुख्यम् ऐश्वर्यम् ॥

"Self-Consciousness is the very self of sentiency, It is para-speech (Vak) which ever-shines independently. It is the freedom (स्वातन्त्र्य). It is the supreme power of the Transcendental Self."

चेतयति .... आत्मास्वभावः = The root "Citi" in "Cetayati" (which we find when we split up the word "Cetana" as Cetayati iti cetanah) means the act of Consciousness which has Self-reference characterised by Self-experience, as its essential nature. This is as follows:-

चेतयतीत्यत्र या चितिः = अस्मिन् विग्रहे स्थिता या धातुप्रकृतिवाच्या चित्याख्या क्रिया न तु कर्तृविहितकृत् प्रत्ययान्तवाच्या चितिः.

स्वात्मचमत्कारलक्षणः = "अहम्" इति स्वविषयास्वादरूपः.

तथा हि .... इति उच्यते = Jar is not manifest in itself ie is not conscious of itself; and because it does not shine in itself ie because it does not shine freely or independently, therefore it is said to be insentient.

अपरिच्छिन्नतया न भास्यते = "अहम्". इति अपरिच्छिन्नाभासविषयेण न भूयते, प्रत्युत "इदम्" इति परिच्छिन्नाभासविषयेण भूयते, ततः

स्वात्मनि = स्वविषये, 'अहम्' इति यः संरम्भोद्योगः कारणात्। तस्य यः उल्लासः स एव विभूतिः, तस्याः योगात्, स्वात्मन्येव- न तु परप्रमातर्यपि,

प्रकाशयते = स्वप्रकाशत्वात् इति भावः,

तद्विलक्षणीभावेन, "अहम्" इति यावत्, यस्तु 'अयं चैत्रः' इति परिच्छिन्नतया परामर्शः सः तद्देहादिनिष्ठ एवेति भावः

तच्छून्यता = नीलादिशून्यता, एतेन सौषुप्तावभासस्य ग्रहणम्

आभास्यते = नीलादिग्राहकत्वेनापि स्वात्माऽनुभूयते "अहं"- "नीलादिज्ञानवान्" इति

ततः = तस्मात् कारणात् .... इति, उच्यते:

चितिर्हि चेतनक्रिया सा एव प्रत्यवमर्शस्वरूपम् इति तस्य प्रत्यवमर्शस्य स्वाश्रयादजडात् जडस्य भेदद्योतने सामर्थ्यम् इति भावः॥

But Chaitra, because he has the power of various kinds of feeling and activity, shines in himself as "I" i.e. he is conscious of himself, he therefore shines in himself as different from that limited manifestation which can be referred to as "this" in so far as he is affected by innumerable manifestations such as nila, pita, pleasure, pain & their absence. Therefore it is said that Caitra is sentient. Thus it is wrong to say that both, free consciousness & not free consciousness, have their mutually exclusive independent existence in themselves.

विमर्शो हि सर्वसहः .... इत्येवं स्वभावः =

विमर्शः = चितिक्रियारूपः प्रत्यवमर्शः,

सर्वसहः = न तु प्रकाशत्वात् बाह्यप्रतिबिंबग्रहणमात्रसमर्थः

अत एव परमप्यात्मीकरोति — भूतावेशसमये इत्यर्थः, तत्र हि अहम् अमुकवटस्थो यक्ष इत्यादि ज्ञानमनुभूयते, पुनः किं क्रियते इत्यत आह "आत्मानम्" इति, "नाहं चैत्रोऽस्मि" इति भावः

उभयमपि एकीकरोति = "य एव वटयक्षः स एवाहम्"

द्वयम् — आत्मानं परञ्च "अहं चैत्रोऽपि नास्मि — इति यक्षो नास्मि" इत्यर्थः

Vimarsha, free consciousness, is all powerful, identifies itself with others, denies its self, merges both into one (as in Sadashiva state) and denies both, which have been merged into one. Such is its essential nature.

प्रत्यवमर्शश्च = चित्रूपतया प्रत्यवमर्शनम्, आन्तरश्च = बाह्ये-
मध्यमाभावेन स्थितम, न तु पश्यन्तीपदम
आरूढं वैखरीभावं वा पतितम्, आन्तरत्वे तु
पराभावेन स्थितम् ॥

अभिलापात्मकम् = व्यक्तवाग्रूपम्, न तु कुक्कुटादिरूपवत्

शब्दनम् = शब्दोच्चारणं सः स्वभावः यस्य तादृशः, अव्यक्तम्,
शब्दस्मृतेरेव विकल्परूप प्रत्यवमर्शत्वात्, एतेन वाकूत्वं

तत् च शब्दनम् = प्रत्यवमर्श स्वरूपभूतं शब्दनम् साधितम्।

संकेत निरपेक्षमेव = बाह्य शब्दवत् संकेतापेक्षारहितमेव,
बाह्यशब्दवत् संङ्केतापेक्षारहितमेव॥ अन्यथा सद्योजातबालस्य तदुत्पादो न स्यात्, तस्यापि
हि सूक्ष्मः "अहम्" इति परामर्शो विद्यते एव,
अन्यथा स्वात्मार्थं स्तन्याभिलषणाम युक्तं स्यादिति
भावः

तथा अविच्छिन्नः = इदन्तास्पर्शाभावेन परमात्मनः
अप्रच्युतः यः चमत्कारः – "अहम" इति स्वरूपः
स्वरूपास्वादः स आत्मा यस्य तादृशम्,

✻ अत एव अन्तर्मुखः यः शिरोनिर्देशः तस्य सदृशम्

And Self consciousness or Pratyavamarsha also in its essential nature is no other than the inner Speech. This Speech is independent of indicatory signs and is essentially unbroken Self-experience, free from objective relation; it is like inward shaking of head, it is the very life of the indicatory sounds "a" etc, which are used in as indicatory sounds in the sphere of Maya. It is the back ground of other determinate cognitions such as 'this is jar' & 'I am Chaitra' etc

This is called "para" because of its perfection. It is 'Vak' because of its speaking of (referring to) the universe by means of

inner sound in determinate apprehension. Therefore, as sentient, resting in itself & perfectly independent, it is always manifest, without an interruption, as "I". This Highest Lord's principal power of freedom, is spoken of as His 'Aiśvarya', independence of others or omnipotence. Higher & lower (parāpara Vāk) is in the state of paśyanti at the Sadāśiva level, because in it, the consciousness of the external, which is to be referred to as "this" and which depends upon the obscuration of the real nature of Self, just arises, yet it rests on Self-consciousness. At the lower (aparā Vāk) is in those in whom the element of "this" is predominant and who are possessed of power within the pale of Māyā, such as Brahmā, Viṣṇu & Indra etc. But their power is due to the favour of the Highest Lord. Therefore in reality, the independence of others is nothing else than Supreme bliss (Ānanda) omnipotence, freedom and sentiency. Therefore it has been said "He is different from insentient"

* एत एव अन्तर्मुखः यः शिरोनिर्देशः —शिरः कम्पादिना कृतः वस्तु निर्देशः तस्य च सदृशम् ॥

पूर्णत्वात् = एकरूप परा शब्दस्य हि पूर्णत्वमेवार्थ, तथा च गर्भस्थित-
सकल पश्यन्ती मध्यमा वैखरी रूप सकल वाक्प्रपंचा इत्यर्थः।

प्रत्यवमर्शेन — प्रत्यवमर्श वृत्त्या न तु उच्चार वृत्त्या ॥

स्वरसोदिता — स्व– स्वात्म भूतः यः रसः → आस्वादः, न तु कस्यापि

केनापि प्रयत्नेन, स्वभावेन इति यावत् । स चास्या चिद्रूपतैव इति

कीदृश्या → स्वात्मनिया विश्रान्तिः — 'अहम्' इति विश्रमणम् सा वपुः यस्याः

उदिता = सदानस्तमिता — सदोदितेत्यर्थः, सकृद्विभातेति यावत् ॥ तादृश्यम् ॥

नित्या → 'अहम्' इत्येव → नित्याहन्ताभावेन स्फुरणशीलेत्यर्थः ।

एतदेव च = प्रत्यवमर्श एव च ·

परमात्मनः — प्रकाशरूपस्य अपरिमितप्रमातुः, न तु ग्राहकाभिमतस्य मितप्रमातुः, ..

अख्यातिप्राणस्य = मायाजीवितस्य, उद्बोधमात्रेऽपि = प्रादुर्भावमात्रेऽपि न तु स्वकार्योन्मुख्ये

निरूढा = विश्रान्तौ

तत् = ऐश्वर्यम् तेषाम् = सदाशिवादीनाम्

परमेश्वरप्रसादजम् = परप्रकाशरूप परशिवप्रसादजम्.

तस्मात् = प्रत्यवमर्शस्य हि जडाजडभावविवेचकत्वं स्फुटमेव अनेन श्लोकेन कथितमिति भावः

It has been shown even in principal Agamas that the most ... of Characteristic of the light of Consciousness is Sentiency. This is what the author Says:-

प्रधानागमेष्वपि = महाऽद्वैतवादिषु, मालिनिविजयादि प्रधान शास्त्रे

एतत् = प्रकाशस्य विमर्श प्राधान्यम् ॥

सा स्फुरत्ता महासत्ता देशकालाविशेषिणी ।
सैषा सारतया प्रोक्ता हृदयं परमेष्ठिनः ॥१४॥

योजना :- सा स्फुरत्ता (स्फुरण कर्तृता --- भवनकर्तृता- विश्वविस्तारः चिति क्रिया शक्ति), महा-सत्ता (विश्वजीवनम्), देशकाल-अविशेषिणी (अस्पर्शिणी), सा एवा सारतथा परमेष्ठिनः (परमे पदे तिष्ठतः ब्रह्मनः) हृदयं (प्रतिष्ठास्थानं विमर्शरूपम्) प्रोक्तः (आगमेषु अभिधीयते) ॥ स्फुरणं = स्पन्दनम्, "सारम्" = इति यत् अनुदृष्ट, है

Eng: It is the eternal Stir (सा स्फुरत्ता), the Supreme Reality (महा सत्ता). It is beyond the limitations of time & space. This (चितिः) being the essence of all (सारः) is spoken of as the heart (ie the resting place) of the highest Lord (Self).

A question is often raised "why is it that jar exists but not the "sky-flower"? In reply to this question people say: "jar is, because it is manifest to me, but the other is not." Now if manifestation be taken to be identical with the very being of jar, it should be manifest to all or to none. Therefore what is the meaning of "jar" is manifest to me"? It means jar has attained my consciousness or Sphurna, (Sanskrit Synonym for which is "Spanda") the seeming vibration. Now Spanda means slight motion, and here slightness lies in its appearing to vibrate while it actually does not;

अस्ति = सत्तां भजते, तस्य अस्तित्वेन प्रसिद्धत्वात्
इति उक्ते .... = निर्णयपरेण केनापि पृष्टे सति एवम्
इति वक्तारो भवन्ति = एवमुत्तरकर्तारः भवन्ति ॥ कि अस्मा॰
इतरत् = खपुष्पम्, न स्फुरति, अतो नास्तीति भावः
तत् = तस्मात्कारणात्, एतत् = भासमानम्
स्फुरत्त्वम् = स्फुरणकर्तृत्वम्, अस्य पर्यायमाह स्फुरणसंबन्धः = स्फुरण क्रिया संबन्धः, कर्तुः क्रिया-संबन्धस्य घटत्वे कंचित् प्रत्येव दृश्येत ॥
मदीये = मम प्रमातुः संबन्धि, स्फुरणम् = प्रकाशरूपा स्फूर्तिः

essential nature of light of consciousness is not to change at all, yet it appears to be changing as it were, having as it were variety of manifestation. This is what the following quotation says:—

स्पन्दनम् = धरविषयीकरणरूपं किंचित् चलनम्,

अविभ्रम् = एवम् अर्थो भवतीत्यर्थः,

नातिरिच्यते = चलनरूपविशेषयुक्तं न संपद्यते

अतिरिच्यते इव = घटादिस्फुरणे *

लोकेऽपि .... स्पन्दवान् इति उच्यते।: In ordinary life also a person, though changing in many ways, yet if he does not change his real nature, is spoken as grave ie of little flutter.

महती = अपरिच्छिन्ना भवति, सैव = प्रत्यवमर्शरूप चितिरेव

सृजति = विमर्शरूपत्वेन परमप्रकाशस्वरूपात् च्यावयति, भासयतीति यावत्,

विमर्शरूपो विसर्गो हि त्रिधा, स्थूल, सूक्ष्मः, परश्च.

इति = अतः कारणात्, ताभ्याम् = देशकालाभ्याम्,

विशेषणीया न भवति = न हि तत् सृष्टस्य तद्विशेषणत्वं युक्तं

तयो = देशकालयोः, तस्य = विमर्शस्य,

प्रकाशे = परप्रकाशविषये प्रतिबिंबतया स्फुरणे, परप्रमाता हि स्वात्मानमहमिति गृह्णन् तमहंभावमपि स्वात्मविश्रान्त्यैव गृह्णाति, अन्यथा तस्यापि बाह्यविकल्पत्वापातात् ⊕ see slip.

तन्निर्माणयोगात् = देशकालसर्जनसमये ताभ्यां अस्पृष्टतया संबन्धात्,

ततोऽपि = देशकालाभ्यां बहिरपीत्यर्थः, तयोरन्तर्गतत्वादिति भावः

अतुच्छम् = न तु भावराशिवत् भावमात्रसिद्धम्

प्रकाशात्मकं रूपम् = सारतया स्थितः प्रकाशभागः, धरसारतया स्थितः मृद्भाग इव,

तस्यापि = ग्राह्यादिगतस्य प्रकाशात्मरूपस्य च.

In ordinary life also a person, though changing in many ways, yet, he does not change his real nature, is spoken of as grave ie of little flutter.

« The Self (Atmā) itself, which is essentially restful light of consciousness, appearing to vibrate (sphuran) in all objects, is Shiva, the operation of whose will is free from obstruction and whose powers of knowledge & action are ever active ».

« The transcendental motion (spanda) stands clear before a yogin who concentrates on the state of freedom from affection, which is attained (without effort) at the time when he is extremely angry, excessively joyous, at a loss to know what to do or is running for life ».

« For a clear grasp of the essential nature of the transcendental motion »

« The flow of the (special) transcendental movement, the qualities (Satta, Rajas and Tamas) »

—

तस्याक्षेपिका = आक्षेपकारिणी, प्रकाशिकेति यावत्, न केवलं परप्रकाशस्यैव वैलक्षण्याक्षेपिकेयमपि तु सर्वेषां ग्राह्यग्राहकाणाम् इति अपि शब्दाभिप्रायः ॥

शक्ति प्रत्यभिज्ञानम् = प्रत्यवमर्शरूपायाः चितेः प्रत्यभिज्ञा

प्रतिष्ठायाः = स्वस्य विश्वस्य च स्थितेः,

स्थानम् = व्यवस्थापकत्वात्, विमर्शेनैव हि प्रकाशस्य भावानां च स्वरूपव्यवस्था भवति, तत्र प्रतिष्ठितस्पन्दरूपाया प्रकाशव्यवस्था "स्वभावमवभासस्य" इति न्यायेन विशेषस्पन्दरूपाया भावव्यवस्थेति विभागः ॥

तत् च = हृदयं च, चेतनम् = सारतया प्रोक्तः परिच्छिन्नः प्रकाशभाग एव भवति,

चेतन तस्यापि = चेतनस्यापि, प्रकाशात्मकत्वे भवति

तस्यापि = चेतनात्मतया स्थितस्य शुद्धप्रकाशस्यापि विमर्श शक्तिः भवति

सर्वस्य = समस्तस्य चेतनवर्गस्य ॥

तिष्ठतः → विश्रान्तस्य – विगृहीतस्य समस्तत्वेन परामर्श करोति,

इदं विमर्शरूपमेव = प्रत्यवमर्श स्वरूपमेव, पठितै

तस्य = परमेष्ठिनः, ग्राहकसार विज्ञानसार – शुद्धप्रकाशसारत्वात्,

हृदयम् यत्र तत्र = सर्वसम्प्रदायेषु –

परमन्त्रात्मकम् = महामन्त्रस्वरूपम् ॥

सा च खपुष्पादिकमपि .... ततोऽपि व्यापकत्वनित्यत्वे॥

The word "Satta" means the essential nature of the agent in the act of being i.e. freedom in all actions. It is great, because it pervades even the Sky-flower. It is not limited by time or space, for it is ~~their~~ their creator. The reason is that only that which shines at the same level can serve as an attribute,

तयो = ~~दे~~देशकालयो

⊕ देशकालयोस्त्विदन्तया ग्रहणं स्फुटमेव,
तथा च तद्ग्रहणकाले तस्या ग्रहणं
नास्ति, तद्ग्रहणकाले च तयोरिति का
विशेषणविशेष्यभाव कथेति भावः

ननु तद्विमर्शनं किंरूपमिति आह "परा"-

परा या वाक् – समनन्तरोक्ता चितिरूपा,
तस्या या शक्तिः तन्मयम्, विशेषस्पन्द-
रूपमित्यर्थः। एवं ग्राहकवर्गगतस्य
विशेषस्पन्दरूपस्य प्रत्यवमर्शस्य मन्त्र-
त्वसाधनेनापरिमित प्रमातृगतस्य
सामान्यस्पन्दात्मकस्य प्रत्यवमर्शस्य
महामन्त्रत्वम् यत्न ~~सिद्धम्~~ सिद्धमेवेति भावः ॥

इत्यादि = कर्म, इत्येवंरूपे स्वागमेषु
उक्तमिति संबन्धः

ते विना = मन्त्रौ विना इत्यर्थः – प्रत्य-
वमर्शप्राणत्वात् सर्वस्येति भावः ॥

मातृभावम् = अवर्गादिरूपवर्गाष्टकात्मक
ब्राह्म्यादिमातृभावम् ॥

इति च अतः कारणात्
इयं सत्ता महती - अपरिच्छिन्ना भवति
सैव = प्रत्यवमर्शरूपा चितिरेव,
सृजति = विमर्शरूपत्वेन परमप्रकाशस्वरूपात्
स्थापयति, भासयतीति यावत् ।
विमर्शरूपो विसर्गो हि त्रिधा,
स्थूल, सूक्ष्मः, परश्च ॥ →

तत्र परः अकारवाच्यः आनन्दरूपत्वात्,
ऐक्याभेदप्रधानस्य शिवतत्त्वस्य प्रादुर्भावः
एतच्च निराभासादिति मङ्गलश्लोके ।
प्रतिपादितम् ।
ननु कथं तस्यैवाहंविमर्शरूपस्य शक्तितत्त्व-
स्य स्वाविर्भाविकत्वं युक्तम्? सत्यम्,
आविर्भाविकत्वकथने बोधनमात्र प्रयोजनम्
परमार्थतस्तु सर्वदा तत्तत्त्वम् न तु केनापि च,
क्वचिदेव ॥

सूक्ष्मः → अः इत्यनेनोच्यते तेन च भेदाभेद
प्रधानस्य सदाशिवादेः शुद्धविद्यान्तस्य
तत्त्वजातस्य प्रादुर्भावः ।
स्थूल एवापरश्च हकारवाच्यः, तेन
भेदप्रधानस्य मायादेः तत्त्वसमूहस्य
प्रादुर्भावः इति स्फुटमेव स्थूलभावेन
अस्या एव देशकाल प्रकृतित्वम् ॥

ताभ्याम् = देशकालाभ्याम् ।
विशेषणी न भवति → नहि तत् सृष्टस्य
तद्विशेषणत्वं युक्तम्, तत्सृष्टेः
पूर्वं तदविशिष्टतया सिद्धस्य तस्योत्तर-
काले तद्विशेषणतया व्यर्थत्वात् ॥

P.T.O.

गुणादिस्पन्दनिष्यन्दाः = गुणत्रय प्रधानाः सुखादि-
स्पन्द प्रवाहाः, सामान्यस्पन्द-
संश्रयात् लब्धात्मलाभाः सन्तः
शस्य परिपन्थिनो न स्युरिति
संबन्धः ॥

"लोके" इति → वैचित्र्याणि तेषां योगेन.

स्पन्दवत्त्वम्, - किञ्चित्क्षोभावेशात् अचलत्वेन
गम्भीरत्वमिति विवेकः ।

प्रकाशस्पन्दो हि स्वरूप प्रत्यवमर्शी व्यतिरिक्तो
न संभवत्येव तत् ~~सत्~~ सन्निधौ तद्व्यतिरिक्त
स्य सर्वस्य वह्निसन्निधाविव तूलराशेर संभवा
प्रत्यवमर्शस्तु तदैश्वर्य विजृंभामयत्वेन तत्
कल्पितः, न तादृशीमयोग्यतामावहतीत्य-
लम्.

~~भवेन~~ भवने = सत्तायाम्.

इति। तस्माद्धातोश्च कर्तरि लट् तदुपरि च शतृप्रत्ययः
सोऽपि स्थानिवद्भावेन कर्तर्येव, ततः "श्नसोरल्लोपः"
इत्यलोपः, ततः ------ ॥ ... तस्य सतः भावः
स्वरूपभूतो येन तत् सन्नित्युच्यते, सा सत्ता भावे
तल्प्रयोगात्, एतेन प्रत्ययेन धर्मिणो निष्कृष्टः
कर्तृता साधकः भवनक्रियारूपः केवलो धर्म उच्यते
सा च फलतः प्रादुर्भावः तमेव चाश्रित्य सर्वाः क्रियाः
स्वरूपं लभन्ते, पचतीत्यादौ प्रयोगे हि पचन्
भवतीत्यादिरर्थ एव परमार्थतोऽस्ति भवनाभावे
पाचकत्वायोगात्, अतोऽस्य

सो च — सत्ता च

ख पुष्पादिकमपि व्याप्नोति = सर्वक्रिया
स्वातन्त्र्यात्

A a B b

E

c

$2\sqrt{4}$

What is

S

What is your

What
Teeth.
eye
nose
ear.
Hair
legs.

as bangles do in the case of Chaitra. But time & space do not shine at the same level with free consciousness (vimarsha). The former shine as "this" but the latter shine as "I". Thus, it is above time & space; it is therefore, all pervading and eternal. But it is also in touch with all times and places, because it is there creator. For this reason also it is called omnipresent and eternal.

सैषा .... विमर्शने च परावाक्शक्तिमयम् ॥

By this "That this" (सैषा) recognition of the power is implied. "हृदयम्" means main stay or resting place. And, according to formerly established theory, the insentients rest in the sentient and the latter rests in the light of consciousness with which it is one, and the place of rest of this also the power, of the free Consciousness. Therefore in different authoritive texts the same is spoken of as the resting place of the universe, which ultimately rests in Param Shiva, the highest abode of all. For the heart, the resting place (हृदयम्) of all Mantras which, in its essence is nothing but free-consciousness, which also is simply the power of transcendental speech (परावाक्)

"न तैर्विना ----- चितेर्गते" .... without Mantras there will be no sound, no meaning, nor the grasp of the light of consciousness".

"तत्र तावत्समापन्न ..... = Having attained the state of Matrs (Brahmi etc).

न सोऽस्ति .... प्रत्यवमर्शिनी ॥ सैषा ..... काष्ठकुड्यवत्

"There is no such cognition as is not accompanied by speech. All experiences at the time when we have them, are as it were penetrated by speech."

"This speech as presented above, is the consciousness of transmigrating being. It is both internal and external. In the absence of it a transmigrating being is seen unconscious like wood & wall."

तत् एतेन .... निर्वाहितम् = Thus (by showing that this theory is supported by others also) that the author has justified the use of (plural in) "विदुः".

बौद्धैरपि .... अध्यवसायस्य इति ॥ The Bodhas also, who hold that validity of cognition depends upon the intellectual reaction (अध्यवसाय) have almost accepted this theory, because the most essential nature of the intellectual reaction is (inner) speech.

न अतिरिच्यते = चलनरूपविशेषयुक्तं न संपद्यते, अतिनिर्मलत्वेन न किंचित्-कल्पत्वात्, अन्यथा अतिनिर्मलत्वायोगात्, अतिनिर्मलं हि तदुच्यते यत् स्वयम् असद् इव परं प्रतिबिम्बतया भासयति, अतिनिर्मलत्व-अनाकुली-अनङ्गीकारे तु प्रकाशत्वाऽयोगः, प्रकृष्टे काशने हि समलस्य न संभवति मलावृतत्वात्, न किंचित्त्वे च किंचिद्रूपस्य चलनस्यायुक्तत्वं स्फुटमेव, नहि अति मुक्तसारे वस्तुनि स्थूलस्य अवस्थात् संभवः, तथापि च यत् प्रतिबिंबतया भासनं तदेव किंचित्त्वेन साधितम्, यद्यपि अस्ततः किंचित्त्वमयुक्तमेव तथापि सत्यता-भ्रमग्रस्तान् प्रत्येवमुक्तम् इत्यलं प्रपंचेन।
ननु यदि नातिरिच्यते तर्हि स्पन्दोऽस्य नास्त्येवेत्यत आह -
अतिरिच्यत इव इति। अतः कारणात्
तत् = प्रकाशस्वरूपम्, अचलमेव सत्

आभासभेदयुक्तमिव च = चलत्वारूढ
आभासभेदसहितमिव च, भाति,
तथास्वभावत्वात्, न च स्वभावस्य
पर्यनुयोगो युक्त इति भावः॥

असंख्या याः शक्तयः = जगत्गत पदार्थ रूपा शक्तयः
तासां या श्रेणी = पङ्क्तिस्तया शोभितम् - विशेषितं वपुः = स्वरूपं यस्य तादृशे,
परमशिवे = शिव शक्ति सामरस्य रूपे परमशिवाख्ये सप्तत्रिंश तत्त्वे
इत्थंकारम् = इत्थं कृत्वा, कुप्रकारेणति यावत्,
कस्मात् = कुतो हेतो, विमर्श शक्तिरेव = अहं प्रत्यवमर्श-शक्तिरेव,
अभिषिञ्चयेत = अभिषेक युक्ता संपाद्यते, महाधिकारिपदे स्थाप्यते ॥

आत्मानमत एवायं ज्ञेयी-कुर्यात्पृथक्स्थिति।
ज्ञेयं न तु तदौन्मुख्यात् खण्डयेतास्य स्वतन्त्रता ॥२५॥

योजना:- अत एव अयम् (विमर्शरूपः प्रकाशात्मा परमेश्वरः) आत्मानम् (स्वात्मानम्) ज्ञेयी कुर्यात् (अज्ञेयमपि ज्ञेयी करोति) ज्ञेयं तु न पृथक्-स्थिति, तद् औन्मुख्यात् अस्य स्वतन्त्रता (स्वातन्त्र्यम् - आत्मनः स्वरूपम्) खण्डयेत (अन्याधीनत्वं नाम पारतन्त्र्यम् अस्य आनीयते) ॥

Eng: Because of this Stir (स्पन्दः) or the power of Creative Thought (विमर्श शक्तिः) therefore (अत एव) He (the Self) makes Himself as the object of Knowledge (अयं ज्ञेयी कुर्यात्). The objects have no separate existence (ज्ञेयम् न तु पृथक्स्थिति) If it be contrary to that (तत औन्मुख्यात) his freedom would be lost (shattered) (अस्य स्वातन्त्र्यता खण्डयेत).

स्वातन्त्र्यामुक्तमात्मानं स्वातन्त्र्याद्द्वयात्मनः
प्रभुरीशादि संकल्पैः निर्माय व्यवहारयेत् ॥२६॥

योजना:- अद्वयात्मनः (महेश्वरस्य) स्वातन्त्र्यात् स्वातन्त्र्य-अनुकम्पे (युक्तम्) आत्मानम् (ईशादि रूपं) निर्मीय, प्रभुः - ईशादि - संकल्पैः व्यवहारयेत, (व्यवहारेण योजयति भावनादि व्यवहारार्थं - अथवा - जगत् - व्यवहारार्थं ॥

Eng: "As the Self is without a second and is perfectly free, so by means of mere will (संकल्प-इच्छारूपा), He creates (ईशा etc) who are full of power of freedom, & makes them objects of meditation etc in ordinary life."

The power of action, the essence of which is omnipotence, includes all powers. And this is of the nature of free consciousness (vimarsha). Therefore, it is right to give prominence.

ऐश्वर्यात्मा = ऐश्वर्यरूपा, समाक्षिपति = स्वान्तः करोति, सा च = कर्तृत्व शक्ति च, विमर्शरूपा = प्रत्यवमर्शस्वरूपा, विमर्शपूर्वमेव करणसंभवात्, यस्तु तत्र कायादिव्यापारो दृश्यते सोपि विमर्शपूर्वक एवेति स्फुटमेव विमर्शशक्तिः कर्तृत्वम् ॥

इति = अतः कारणात्, अस्या एव = विमर्शशक्तेरेव प्राधान्यम् = सर्वशक्तिभ्यः प्रधानता,

The Lord whose essential nature is light (of Consciousness) →

{ ज्ञात्रेकरूपत्वात् = ज्ञातृत्वमेकं रूपं यस्य सः, तस्य भावस्तत्त्वं तस्मात्, → Manifests Himself as the
{ अज्ञेयमपि = ज्ञेयताऽसहमपि, objects of Knowledge,

though in reality He is Subject only & therefore not the object of Knowledge

यत् संभाव्यते = This is what is established as the only possibility; because by means of strong inferential proofs in support of this possibility.

कारणान्तरस्य = स्वव्यतिरिक्तोपादानादि कारणाना सामग्र्याः

अनुपपत्तेः = अयोग्यत्वात्,

दृढेन = न तु शिथिलेन, संभावनानुमानेन = "स्यादेतत्" इति संभावनारूपेणानुमानेन,

ज्ञेयीकरोति = अज्ञेयं सत् स्वयं स्वशक्तिास्वादन क्रीडार्थं ज्ञेयतया भास
तत् = यच्छब्दोक्तं वस्तु, कर्तृत्वात् हेतोः = स्वातन्त्र्यात् हेतो याति,
भवति = सिद्ध्यतीत्यर्थः,

And this He does, because of His freedom, the distinctive feature of which is the power of free Consciousness.

Because He is self conscious and because the world is within Him, therefore He manifests Himself as object. But how can there be this very possibility that He manifests Himself as object. Reply is that the object cannot have its existence apart or separate from the light of consciousness.

यतः हि = यस्मात् कारणात्, अयम् = प्रकाशरूपः परमात्मा,
ततः = तस्मिन्नंशे, आत्मानं परामृशति = अहमिति परामर्श विषयतां नयति,
विश्वनिर्भरत्वात् = वस्तवस्तुरूपसर्व जगत् भरितत्वेन,
तथा नीलादित्वेन = परामर्शानुगुणेन नीलादिभावेन,
चकास्ते = भासते, तत्स्वभावत्वात्, अन्यथा भावाभावरूप जगत् भानासंभवात् ॥
तु अवधारणे = The particle 'तु' emphasises
अभ्युच्चययुक्तिमपि = more arguments are also given below.
यदि व्यतिरिक्तं ज्ञेयं .... पारतन्त्र्यं च विरु स्वातन्त्र्य विरुद्धम् ॥

If the object of knowledge be separate or different from the universal Subject, the intentness of the Subject on Object, of which we know from our own experience, will not be possible, because that intentness on the Object, which is different from it, means His (Subject's) dependence upon the latter. And dependence is quite opposite of freedom.

इति व्यतिरिक्तोन्मुखे = If the Self be seeking the help of another

अनात्मा च ...... इति प्रसङ्गः ॥ And not-self being insentient, there can be no possibility of its seeking any help. This is the unwelcome conclusion.

ततः ...... स्वी कुर्यात्करोति ॥ Therefore from this opposite conclusion it follows that Self does not seek external help, and consequently being free it manifests its own Self as object of knowledge.

(2) न च केवलं नीलादिरूपं एव ...... इति संबन्धः = He creates not only external objects of perception such as blue etc, but others only in which the characteristic nature of doer & power of freedom are markedly present & makes them objects of meditation & worship etc. This also is possible only if what has been stated in the previous verse be accepted as true. This is the connection of this verse with previous one.

ननु स्वातन्त्र्ययुक्तं ...... इदम् = But is there is no self-contradiction in saying that the object is created & it is is full of power of freedom.

अद्वयतात्मनः ...... न युज्यते = The reply is that, that self which is without a second and is pure light of consciousness is perfectly free. Therefore, what has been asserted above is reasonable.

यत् किल मायापदे ...... द्रष्टितम् = The word "freedom" (स्वातन्त्र्य) implies unobstructed freedom in creating that which is in

अनन्यमुखप्रेक्षित्वम् = स्वप्रसिद्धौ परानपेक्षा

अयं भावः — आत्मा हि ज्ञातृत्वेनैवात्मा भवति, अन्यथा घटादेरप्यात्मत्वप्रसङ्गात्, अतः ज्ञेयेनैवात्मसिद्धिः, तत् च यदि व्यतिरिक्तं तर्हि स्फुटैवात्मनोऽन्यापेक्षा, परापेक्षाग्रस्त आत्मा चात्मैव न स्यात्। स्वं तत्त्वं हि आत्मा, यस्य च परापेक्षा तस्य तदधीनता समये स्वतत्त्वं हीयते, परकीयत्वापातात्, वस्तुतः तद्धानौ च सातत्यगमनं न स्यात्। सातत्यगन्तृत्वं हि आत्मशब्दार्थः, तत् च लक्षणया स्वरूपे सदा तथैवास्थानमेव न कुत्रापि सदागमनम्, तत्र गत एव हि प्रायस्तत्रस्थ उच्यते इति तन्तेन निर्देशः।

ज्ञेयस्य स्वाव्यतिरिक्तस्य स तु स्वाधीनत्वमेव तत् च नाधीनत्वम्, यतस्तदेव स्वातन्त्र्यमिति

the sphere of Māyā seems extremely difficult.
एतत् एव .... एव पुनरुक्तम् = "Because of
this alone" (एतत् एव) refers to the essential nature
of the power of free-consciousness. Therefore
there is no repetition.

अथवा .... संबन्धनीयम् = Or there is another
construction possible, namely, "because of
this freedom alone" (एतत् एव स्वातन्त्र्यात्).
The two words, thus, refer to the same thing
& are connected with both the verses. The
author illustrates the point as follows:-

नीलादि निर्माणवत् अस्य .... सैव प्रधानम् इति =
Although we do not know any instance of crea-
tion of that which is full of power of freedom
as we know that of blue etc, yet, because
to meditation or worship in his meditation
on the Lord, the glorious, the Self, the eternal
the omnipresent or the free etc, the object
of worship or meditation or observation of
appears as distinct, it is therefore created.
But it is not other than Ishwara, because
in that case there would remain no difference
between meditation on Ishwara and on Anishwara.
But this is not the case. For, the effects of
two meditations are different. Therefore both
the kinds of objects, one full of power of free-
dom & the other devoid of it, are non-different
from Self and are manifested by the Lord
by virtue of His power of free-consciousness.
Therefore that is the chief power.

अस्य = स्वतन्त्रस्य उपास्यस्य ध्येयस्य इति = भोग मोक्ष-प्रदस्य, नीलादि निर्माण: शिवनेन हि ज्ञानेन शिवनेन हि ईश्वरादि इति मन्त्रः
उपास्यम् = नीलादि उपासनादि ध्येयं वा,
तत् = ज्ञातव्यम्
सैव = विभिन्न-फलत्वेन
एवमेव = ईश्वरादि मूर्तयः

ननु .... तत् एतत् परिहर्तुमाह :- .

The objects shine as distinct from one another, because of the light of universal Consciousness. The essence, however, of that light of Consciousness (prākāsh) is Vimarsha. Hence, because Vimarsha is non different from light of Consciousness, therefore the only thing that we can say is "that is that" only i.e. prākāsha & vimarsha are identical. But in our determinate subjective reflection, such as that on Isvara or Self etc, the created is thought as "This" but the "freedom" is thought as "I".
The created therefore, not being of the nature of Self-Consciousness, how can it be represented to be not devoid of power of freedom? The answer given by the teacher is:-

नाहन्तादिपरामर्शभेदादस्यान्यतात्मनः
अहंमृष्यतयैवास्य सृष्टेरितैर्वाच्यकमवत्
॥१६॥

योजना :- (ईश्वरादि) अहंतादिपरामर्शभेदात् अस्य आत्मनः अन्यता (भेदः अन्यान्यरूपता) न (युक्ता). अस्य (आत्मनः) सृष्टेः (सृज्यमानस्य) अहंमृष्यतयैव (अहं-विमर्शनीयत्वेन, (तद्भेदः) तिङ्वाच्यकर्मवत् (भवति).

Eng: "The universal Self Consciousness and Isvara etc. do not become different from one another simply because of difference in the forms of judgement related to them. For, the judgements related to the created ultimately rest on the universal

Self-Consciousness, just as the Consciousness of meaning of a noun, derived from a root, rests on the Consciousness of the action, represented by personal termination."

अहंता का अर्थः- स्वरूपे तत्भाव, असंवन्धात, स्वरूपहि धर्मी भावस्त, स्वरूपगतः शब्द-प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तभूतो धर्मः॥

स्वरूपे = अहमिति अहमित्यव्ययम् अन्यातिरिक्ते प्रकाशे वर्तते तस्य भावः अहमिति स्वरूपविमर्शलक्षणोऽहंता सैव प्रकाशस्य निजं लक्षणम् ॥

भाव प्रत्ययः – तल प्रत्ययः

The affix, expressive of state (तल्) is used here in the sense of essential nature.

तिङ् = The word 'personal termination (तिङ्) implies all affixes which stand for action.

कर्मग्रहणे क्रियावाचि सदसत्त्वभूत शक्तिरूपोपलक्षणम् = The 'word action' (कर्म) is used to imply power (शक्ति) which is not of the nature of substance.

अहं इत्येवं स्वरूपो यः परामर्शो ---------- सृज्यमानस्य अहंविमर्शनीयत्वमेव =

[illegible] "शब्दे प्रकृतिं व्याचष्टे "अहम" इति, तल् प्रत्ययार्थमाह– "स्वरूपः" इति,

आदिगृहीते वस्तु आह 'ईश्वर' इति॥

तेषाम् = परामर्शानां भेदस्तद्भेदस्तस्मात्, तत्राहंपरामर्शः निर्मातृविषयः, ईश्वरादि परामर्शाः निर्मेयविषयाः

ईशनम् = समर्थीभवनक्रिया, शीलम् = निष्प्रयोजना प्रवृत्तिर्यस्य तादृशे।

ज्ञानादौ = ज्ञाने आदि शब्दात्करणे च,

स्वातन्त्र्यं भवति। कर्तरि प्रत्ययोत्पादादिति भावः–

3/4/6/7

तच्च अनन्यमुखप्रेक्षित्वे भवति, तच्च अविच्छिन्न ज्ञानयोगे भवति, विच्छिन्न ज्ञानयोगो हि कादाचित्कत्वेन स्वव्यतिरिक्तहेत्वपेक्षत्वेनान्यमुखप्रेक्षित्वग्रस्त एव, ~~सश्च~~

स अविच्छेदश्च अहं जानामि, अहं करोमि ; इति - एवम्- अस्मदर्थे या विश्रान्तिः भित्तितया तदाश्रयणम्, ~~सा भ~~ सा भवति, स स्फुटं ज्ञानकरणयोरस्मदर्थेऽ ~~पस्मार्थे~~ पदार्थे स्थिततया स्फुरणात्,

इति = अतः कारणात्, अस्य = ईश्वरस्य,

सृज्यमानस्य = संकल्पेन भाव्यमानस्य, अहंपरामर्शनीयत्वमेव = अहंपरामर्श विषयत्वमेव॥

The universal Consciousness assumes the form of "I" and also other innumerable forms such as 'Lord', 'Subject', 'Self', or 'Siva' etc. And although these are apparently different from one another, yet it is wrong to suppose that there is any real difference between the Self which is the Creator and is of the nature of Self-Consciousness, and that which is Created and is Conceived a[illegible]vara" etc, because even the Conscious ne[illegible] 'Isvara' rests on Him whose nature is to Lord, the most essential characteristic of whom is to Know & to do; and because the Capacity to Know etc (ज्ञातृत्व) Consists in freedom ie independence of others ie possession of unlimited ~~ness of~~ power of Knowledge; and unlimitedness of Knowledge lies in resting on "I" as 'I Know', 'I do", there-

fore, the things created by the Lord are to be (ultimately) conceived only as "I".

सृष्टेः इति वा हेतौ पञ्चमी = Or the word "सृष्टेः" may be taken as ending in ablative case, expressive of Causal relation (It will then mean) because the Lord, in His creation of 'Isha' etc by will, creates what is Capable of Self Consciousness.

सृष्टि: ←

अर्हे कृत्यः = सृज्यतया इत्यत्र, इत्यत्र स्थितः कृत्य प्रत्ययः, अर्हमिति सृष्टुं योग्यः — अर्हे सृज्यः,

In the word "सृज्याः" the affix "या" is expressive of Capability

यथा क्रियाकारकः............ तद्वत् अत्रापि =

The meanings, such as actions, (क्रिया), relations Subsisting between a noun and a verb, Conjunction, option, etc which in truth are nothing more than thoughts, expressed by the use of personal termination, instrumental case and particle "च" and "वा" etc respectively, even though they may be give Substantive forms by presenting them in such words as "पाक" "Kartā" (करता), "समुच्चयः" and "विकल्प", yet they rest on the original thoughts, presentable in Such words as "पचति", "चैत्रेण" "च" & "वा". For otherwise they (meanings) will not be grasped. Similar is the case here.

The idea stated above may be elaborated as follows:-

परामर्शो नाम विश्रान्ति स्थानम् .... अहं प्रकाशो हि इयत्तत्वम् =

The word paramarsha means the point of rest (in the thought process). And it is only the culminating point that is truly so. And that is nothing else than the Self-Consciousness. The point of rest that comes in the middle, is like the root (shade) of a tree in going to a village. And that (point of rest, which comes in the middle) is spoken of as created in relation to the culminating point. Hence there is no contradiction. The argument stated above, proves that blue etc, though they constitute the middle points (in the process of thought, yet, because they ultimately rest on the original thought, "the I", the Self-Consciousness, they therefore are identical with Self-Consciousness. Even the Consciousness, "I know this blue" is in reality nothing more than "I shine". This is what has been asserted in the following :-

यथोक्तम् "इदमित्यस्य' इत्यादि =

Of the Consciousness "this" etc.

मूढस्तु .... अनुज्झितस्वातन्त्र्यम् उक्तम् =
आत्माद्ये ....

And because a layman finds false satisfaction in the determinate cognition, because it serves his practical purpose, therefore 'blue' etc have been spoken as devoid of "freedom". But in the case of the Self, even a layman does not consider the thought process complete nor the purpose attained, unless he comes to rest on the original thought. Hence the Self has been spoken of as not devoid of "freedom" even when it is created.

विश्रान्तिस्थानम् → विषयाहं परामर्शानन्तरमेव पुरुषो हि तूष्णीं तिष्ठति, तूष्णीं भावश्च विषयसुखानुभव स एव च विश्राम इति स्फुटमेव परामर्शस्य विश्रान्तिस्थानत्वम्।

तत्र = विश्रान्तिस्थाने च।

पार्यन्तिकमेव = पर्यन्ते भवमेव नत्ववान्तरम्,

तत्र = पारमार्थिके विश्रान्तिस्थाने च।

अहमित्येवंरूपमेव → अहं परामर्श एवेत्यर्थः, विषयकृते सुखे विश्रान्तेऽपि हि परमार्थतः स्वात्मविश्रान्त एव भवति॥

अन्यविश्रान्तिपदम् = ईश्वरपरामर्शरूपं नीलादिविषयपरामर्शरूपं चावान्तर - विश्रान्तिस्थानम्॥

ग्रामगमने वृक्षमूलस्थानीयम् — वृक्षमूलसदृशम् ग्राम, ग्रामं गन्ता हि श्रान्तस्मा वद्विश्रामणार्थं वृक्षतले तिष्ठति -

तदपेक्षया → पार्यन्तिकविश्रान्तिस्थानभूताहं परामर्शापेक्षया तत्पूर्वकत्वात् इति भाव

रूपेण → ईश्वरपरामर्शस्याहं परामर्श विश्रान्तिसाधनेन,

अहं प्रकाश इति रचनात्वम् → सत्तावन्मात्र परमार्थः यस्य तत्, भवति नीलादौ अहं परामर्शात, अन्यथाहं प्रयोगासंभवात् इति भावः॥

* स्वमन न संक्षेपः = अस्मान्मन → परप्रकाशनतया ईश्वरतादिरूपतया न
भाविततया प्रमाणमितः। कडत्तादि। प्रमाणस्य यो भेदः मिथ्याविकल्पताकृतस्तत अन्यथा – भेदो न भवति
[illegible] सूत्रं: – दृश्यमानस्येश्वराद: ... इति –

ननु एवं .... परिहारमाह ॥

If all thoughts in reality rest in one pure "I" Consciousness, how can it be said that direct Cognition & remembrance etc are His powers; that Cognition has such varieties as doubt & Certainity etc, and that the material objects such as blue etc are of various kinds. To answer this objection the teacher says:

विश्वपरामर्शानाम् = अयमीश्वर, इदं नीलमित्यादीनां सर्वेषां परामर्शानाम्।

विशुद्धः = विषयोपरागऽरञ्जितत्वेन अतिशुद्धो यः परामर्शः

प्रका: प्रकाशस्य स्वरूपमात्रनिष्ठोऽहंपरामर्शः

स एव तत्त्वम् = यस्य पारमार्थिकं स्वरूपम्,

तत् = तदा, आदिशब्देन अपोहनस्य ग्रहणम्।

अस्य = प्रकाशस्य,

मायाशक्त्या विभोः सैव भिन्नसंवेद्यगोचरा ।
कथिता ज्ञानसंकल्पाध्यवसायादिनामभिः ॥१८॥

योजना:
विभोः (परमेश्वरस्य) सा (अहंविमर्शमयी चितिः) मायाशक्त्या भिन्न-संवेद्यगोचरा (सती) (भेदेन आभासयते) (सा एव चितिः) ज्ञानसंकल्पाध्यवसायादि अनेक-नामभिः कथिता ॥

Eng: "The same free universal Self-Consciousness having as its place of rest the objects of sense-perception which are separated from perceiver by the power of Maya of the Lord, is called by different names such as perception, imagination & ascertainment etc."

तत्र च = अवभासजात मायास्वरूपशक्ते

स्वातन्त्र्यम् = अवभासोद्भावेन समर्थता

अनुपपन्नम् = उपपत्त्यसहम्, अवभासनम् = भेदेन वस्तूनां स्फुरणम्।

ततश्च = तस्मात् कारणात्, भिन्नम् = भेदधर्मितया स्थितम्,

प्रकाशात् = परमप्रकाशाख्यात्प्रतियोगिनः,

अवभासजातम् = नानाविधबाह्यान्तरभावविषयो ज्ञानसमूहः॥

स्वातन्त्र्यम् = अवभासोद्भावेन समर्थता॥

तया भिन्न .... चितिः परावाग्रूपा ......

संशयः स्मृतिः इत्यादि॥

That very Universal Consciousness, whose essential nature is Self-Consciousness & which is nothing else than the Transcendental Speech (वाक्) (परा वाक्), having the objects, — which are separated from the Subject & one another by the power of Māyā, and which are known through senses, which also are separated from the Subject, each other and sense-objects by the same power of Māyā — as its place of rest, is called perception, imagination & ascertainment.

विषयस्य च यत् भिन्नत्वं .... इति सर्वम् अखण्डितम्

The diversity of objects and of internal & external objects senses, which does not appear to be consistent with reason, because the objects are essentially identical with the universal consciousness is manifested by the universal consciousness because it rests on diversity and because diversity does not rest on unity as in the case of Sadashiva and Isvara. And because (in the sphere of Maya

variety constitutes the culminating point, therefore, perception and imagination etc are represented to be the powers of that unifier, the universal free consciousness (samvid), whose oneness with its essential nature always is intact. Accordingly, variety of cognitions such as doubt etc and difference of blue + yellow etc also has been talked of. Thus there remains no objection.

प्रत्यविमर्शात्मकत्वम् = प्रत्यवमर्शस्वभावत्वम्, चितिशक्तिः
अनुभवशक्तिः = चितिशक्तिः, तत्र = तस्यां शक्तौ चैतन्यशक्तिः
कथम् = प्रत्यवमर्शात्मकत्वम इति संबन्धः,
अभिलापविशेषाणाम = प्रतिपदार्थेऽभिन्नतया स्थितानां
शब्दानां या योजना – स्मृत्या योजनं
तन्मयः – तत्स्वरूपः ॥
नहि पूर्वगृहीतसंकेतस्मृतिं विना ज्ञातार्थः शब्दो
योजयितुं शक्यते इति भावः ॥
तत् च = संकेतस्मरणं च, सोऽपि = प्रथमतया स्थितनिर्वि-
कल्प ज्ञान समये
परस्य = तार्किकादेः,
अपोहितुम् = दूरीकर्तुम् ॥

~~But~~ But although determinacy as distinct nature of the Sentient power is not open to any objection in imagination and remembrance etc, which belongs to the sphere of determinate knowledge, yet how can it be maintained to be so in relation to the indeterminate experience, the chief feature of which is immediacy. For, determinate Consciousness (pratyavamarsha) consists in using certain fixed word for the thing perceived. This depends upon remembrance of indicatory word: that on revival of residual traces and that also on similar (previous) perception. Thus how can, at the time of first moment of experience, the application of certain fixed word to the thing perceived be possible? To remove this wrong idea the author says:—

at the time of indeterminate experience

साक्षात्कारक्षणेऽप्यस्ति
विमर्शः कथमन्यथा ।
धावनाद्युपपद्येत
प्रतिसंधानवर्जितम् ॥१९॥

योजना :-

साक्षात्कारक्षणे (निर्विकल्पविज्ञानक्षणे) अपि विमर्शः अस्ति, अन्यथा धावनादि - प्रतिसंधान - वर्जितम् (अनुसंधानेन विना) कथम् उपपद्येत ॥

Eng: At the time of indeterminate experience also there is determinate Consciousness (the essence of which is application of indicatory sign). For, how otherwise will there be the possibility of running etc. if there be no determinate Consciousness (though in a subtle form).

चैतन्यस्य = प्रकाशस्य, अङ्गुलिनिर्देशप्रख्यः = अङ्गुल्या कृतो यो निर्देशः तत् सदृशः

आदिशब्देन शिरआदि निर्देग्रहणम्, अभिलापयोगः = शब्दयोगः, तेन सहाव्यभिचार इति यावत्, अस्तीति शेषः,

अन्यथा = तदभावे,

बालस्य = अथ तावदशिक्षितस्य शिक्षोन्मुखस्य, न तु स्तनंधयस्य स्तनपायिनः

दृश्यमाने सति, व्युत्पत्ति = इत्येवमावापोद्वापाभ्यां संकेतग्रहणकृता निपुणता ।

In the indeterminate experience also there is the association with the inner speech which is the essential characteristic of the self & which is similar to indication by finger etc. For otherwise a child, on seeing a transaction for the first time, would get no knowledge.

निर्विकल्पविज्ञानदरंपरया .... विकल्पव्यापारः ॥

A child hears the word, spoken by another person through a regular succession of indeterminate cognitions; he sees that object before (in regard to which the word, he has just heard, has been used): and then he sees the place without the thing. Now on hearing "bring the jar" or "carry it", how can the consciousness arise in the heart of child that the particular thing is the meaning of a particular word, namely, this is the meaning of the "jar"; this is the meaning of the word "bring"; and this is the meaning of the word "carry". For, the consciousness, that this is the particular object is the meaning of this particular word, depends upon unification. And unification is determinate cognitive activity.

अथ बालस्य .... एवम् ॥ But if anyone were to say that knowledge of the child (on hearing a certain word, used for the first time) is due to remembrance of indicatory words associated with the objects of experience of former birth, we reply as follows:-

तथापि संकेतकाले......... वाचक इति भवति =

That word (in terms of which the knowledge of a child is tried to be explained) because at the time of acquisition of its conventional meaning in the past birth, it was determinately cognised as "this" has to be admitted to have shone as separate from the subject, and to have rested on the subject, identified with intellect (Buddhi-pramata). For, only as such, it could be expressive.

तत् विज्ञानस्य .... स्मरणं च न स्यात् =

If then intellective subject (Bhudhi pramata) were admitted to shine in its essential nature as that on which the words rests, the word would have to be admitted to be an important aspect of the subject. Let it be granted that colour etc as objects, are not essentially of the nature of speech (Abhilāpā). But, just as, though the object is not essentially of the nature of pleasure, yet the intellect-subject (विज्ञान) shines as blissful; so intellect-subject will have to be admitted to shine as identical with the word that rests on it, (at the time of acquisition of convention by the child). According to this system however, the object also is essentially of the nature of transcendental speech, because it is essentially of the nature of

यदि उद्दियात्, तर्हि इति शेषः – किमस्यात् = अत्र अङ्गीकृतायां स्यादध्यवसा- याद् भिन्नम् –

सर्वचिन्तासंहारेण स्तैमित्यं नाम = सर्वचिन्तासंहरणरूपं स्तैमित्याख्यं वस्तु किं स्यात्, स्तैमित्याध्यवसायस्यैव स्तैमित्य- सिद्धिहेतुत्वात् न किमपि स्यात् इति अर्थः॥

इति = अतः कारणात्, तत्रापि = स्तैमित्येऽपि अन्तः परामर्शः अस्ति

एतेनायातं सर्वशब्दानां सर्वार्थविषयत्वं कथीते।

शब्दनम् – कथनम्, वाचकतया योजनम्

तत्रापि = क्षणमात्रस्वभावे साक्षात्कारेऽपि

सः = विमर्शः तत् = तदा

एकाभिसंधानेन = धावनं करोमीत्यादि प्रथम परा- मर्शरूपेणानुसंधानेन

तस्मिन्देशे = धावनविषयीकृते देशे

धावनम् = इतो देशाद्धावनं करोमीति,

तत आचिक्रमिषा = आक्रान्तुमिच्छा,

तर्हि तत् आक्रमणम् = तद्देशाक्रान्तिः *

ततः तितिक्षा = तस्य देशस्य त्यक्तुमिच्छा, ततो देशान्तरानुसन्धि = द्वितीयपदाश्रयभूतस्य देशस्य मनस्यभिसन्धानम्.

अत्र = त्वरितोद् ग्रहणसमये, स्थानानाम् = कण्ठादीनाम् करणानाम् = स्पृष्टत्वादिरूपाणाम्

अत्र = त्वरितोद् ग्रहणसमये च = भाविनी – ततो विश्रम्य स्फुरणशीला न अनुभूयते।

संवर्तितं शब्दभावनात्मकेन = अति सङ्कुचित शब्द परामर्शरूपेण पठनमपि क्रमेण स्यात्

संवीतिता = प्रथमं · शब्दभावना = वर्णोद्धव मध्यगता तत्संयोजन हेतु प्रत्यवमर्शरूपा

तस्य = एकः शृङ्गः इत्यादि

Fm. Page 226 Text-

भेदात् प्रत्यर्त्यं = परप्रमातुः शून्यप्रमातुश्च विच्छित्तीर्यं भूय,
निमीलनः = तस्मिन् काले भासमानः
विज्ञानशरीरे = बुद्धिप्रमातरि ॥ विश्रान्तस्सन् वाचक इति भवति =

∴ परापश्यन्तीभावात् प्रत्यन्ती मध्यमाभावगतस्य बुद्धिप्रमाती निरूढः शब्दो हि स्वार्थविदामितः सन् वाचक इति कथ्यते। तत्रोऽपि च्युतस्तु वैखरीभावमागतः प्राणरूपप्रमातृक्षेत्रे विश्रान्तः तराम्,

तद्विज्ञानस्य = वाचक विश्रान्तिस्थान भूतस्य बुद्धिप्रमातुः,
स्वरूपं चेद भाति = स्वप्रकाशत्वेन स्फुरति
तत् = तर्हि, अभिलापमयमिव = शब्दमयमेव भाति, वाचकविश्रान्तिस्थान-स्वभावत्वात्॥
तज्जन्मान्तर वासनया अभिलापः स्वाभाविक एव सिद्ध इति भावः॥

ज्ञानं = विज्ञानम् भाति = स्फुरति., विषयकृत-तात्कालिक नैरपेक्ष्यवशात् स्वरूपभूत सुखाविर्भावात्॥
तथा = तद्वत्, तदात्मकम् = स्वात्मविश्रान्ताभिलापमयम्।
अवभासिष्यते = स्वप्रकाशत्वेन स्वयं स्वे प्रतिभासन-विषयी भविष्यति

ननु यदि सर्वमभिलापमयमेव तर्हि कथं स्तैमित्यं नाम संभवति — आह :—

विकल्पात्मकः — विकल्परूपः यः प्रमाता — बुद्धिप्रमाता तस्य यो ग्रहणरूपः यो व्यापारः तस्यानुल्लासात्।

स्मरणं च — स्तैमित्यादुत्थितस्य उत्तरकालीनम् "स्तैमित्य मासीत्" इत्येवंरूपा स्मृतिः

ननु यद्येवं तर्हि तत्राध्यवसायः स्फुटः एव भवतु इत्यत आह इदं इति।

रूपविकल्पाध्यवसायः = परामर्शोऽस्यास्तीति — रूपविकल्पाध्यवसायी, स्तैमित्य इति शेषः P.T.O.

free consciousness (चित्स्वरूपत्व). Even the state of senselessness and so forth, if it be not of the nature of determinate cognition, its possibility would in reality be matter of swearing only; because there will be no determinate activity of the subject in it, and consequently there will be no subsequent recollection of it.

रूपविषयाद्यध्यवसायी हि यदि.......... तथा हि =

But if the determinative activity be supposed to arise there as related to some form, (what else (would be the consequence than that) there can be no senselessness which is characterised by absence of all mental activity. Hence it follows that even in the case of senselessness there is subtle determinative activity. All words are capable of expressing all meanings. But at the time of acquisition of convention a particular word is unified with a particular meaning. That is a follows:-

बालस्य पुरतः .... संकेततत्त्वम् =

At the sight of an object in front, a child naturally apprehends it determinately, either subjectively as "I" or objectively as "this". On it either the word "fair complexioned" or "cow" is superimposed. The word also, because of continued use, becomes one with the subject (प्रमातृ). Of the two, one is further superimposed upon "white" and the other as "bull". This is essential nature of convention.

तस्मात् .... तत्स्वरूपभूतो हि सः =

From the above arguments it is clear that in the indeterminate experience there is an element of determinacy. The idea conveyed by word "Api" is that even indeterminate cognition really ends in definite consciousness "I see". That is definite consciousness is an aspect of perception as a function (pratyakṣa) is the view even of the naiyāyaka. And function can never be different from one to whom it belongs, because the former is essential nature of the latter.

भवतु व क्षणमात्रस्वभावः.......... वाचयेत वा=

Or let the indeterminate cognition be admitted to be momentary in its nature, but there is no doubt about it that therein also there is definite consciousness. For, if it be not there, then a person, going hurriedly with one aim, or uttering letters rapidly, or reading a book of hymns rapidly, should not reach, utter, or read the desired. That is as follows:-.

तस्मिन देशे ज्ञानम्..............स्वशक्तिवशात् वर्तित इति =

How can reaching the desired place be possible unless there be determinate consciousness, the essential aspects of which are unification and separation; such as

knowledge of the place, desire to step, stepping, consciousness of the foot having been placed on the right place, desire to leave, consciousness of [illegible] the place, and also to step on it etc.? Similar should be considered to be the case with speaking and reading rapidly etc. In the last two case there is contact of tongue with various places of articulation. Here (in the above cases of reading etc.) hurry consists in the absence of clear determinate knowledge, which follows the indeterminate. Therefore, there must be subtle determinate consciousness, consisting of subtle idea of indicatory sign (word). For, gross determinacy is nothing else than expansion into clear and definite shape of the subtle idea indicatory word. For instance, expansion or clarification of "This" is "jar", "white" etc and of that also is "of the shape of big belly with a bottom" and "with qualities of whiteness inherent in it". The root "Dhavu" according to the text, means to go or to clean. But in the present context, it means to run, because of its own expressive power (independently of any prefix.).

स्वशक्तिवशात् = स्वशक्तिवशेन । धातूनां हि उपसर्गैर्विनापि स्वशक्त्यैव नानार्थत्वम् । – 'धावु गतिशुद्ध्योः'

*। "अङ्" इति, भावे विहित: इत्यर्थ:, स्त्रियां टाबन्तत्वात् स्त्रीलिङ्गम् इत्यर्थ:
अध्यवसेति उपसर्गद्वय पूर्वस्य "षो ऽन्तकर्मणि"
इत्यस्येदं रूपम्, "आदेच" इति ~~ओच~~ ओकारस्याकार:॥

*· परमेश्वर शक्ति विमर्शरूप: = नाकरूपोऽपि परमार्थतोऽहमित्येव
विमर्शरूपा सती।

आत्मवदेव = प्रकाशवदेव.

अहमित्यवदहित्वेन भाति = तत् स्वभावभूतत्वात्, उपरागस्य
न अकिञ्चित्करत्वादिति भाव:.

परप्रतीक्षत्वात् = स्वात्मविश्रान्त्यभावेन विषयानिभृतया ग्रहणात्,
पुन: विमर्शान्तरेण = स्वात्मारोहणार्थं कृतेनान्येन विमर्शेन ;
भाव्यम्, विमर्श विना स्वात्मारोहणाभावात्, स्वात्मारोहं विना
च सोपज्ञाप्यध्यवसायसत् कल्पनेति भाव:॥

नीलस्य प्रकाशनमेव न स्यात् = प्रमातुरध्यवसायग्रहणमात्र एव
क्षीणत्वादिति भाव:

सर्व एव = अहंस्वरूप: नीलादिरूपश्च सामान्यविशेष स्पन्दात्मक:
*।

एवम् : त्वदुक्त प्रकारेण, सूक्ष्मः = शुद्धाहंमात्रस्वरूपः,
प्रकाशशरीरावेशी = प्रकाशस्वरूपाविष्टः, प्रकाशस्य तं विना स्वरूपानुद्भूतेः,
यत्र तु = यस्मिन्नीलादौ, कथं प्रतिभासते, इत्यत आह, 'नीलम्' इति
सः = विकल्परूपः शब्दः, अत्र पुरःस्थितः
"अपि" शब्दो भिन्नक्रमः,

May be the subtle determinate consciousness is present even in the indeterminate in the cases cited above. But in other cases the determinacy consciousness is apparent, because of its grossness. In such case indicatory word shines separately like other external objects, blue etc, e.g. "This is Nila". How can this (indicatory word) be represented as one with essential nature of indeterminacy? For, determinate consciousness is, according to you, non-different from indicatory word, and that (indicatory word) even in the state of Māyā, wherein difference is clearly manifest, is held by you as not having separate existence from indeterminacy. How can this be acceptable.

घटोऽयमित्यध्यवसा नामरूपातिरेकिणी ।
परेशशक्तिरात्मेव भासते न त्विदन्तया ॥२०॥

योजना :–

'अयं घटः' इति अध्यवसा (अध्यवसायः) नामरूप-अतिरेकिणी (अतिरिक्तभूत्वा) परेश-(चिति) शक्तिः(स्व), (तत्तदाकारेण) आत्मा एव (अभेदेन) भासते, न तु (कदाचित्) इदन्तया (विच्छिन्नत्वेन) (भाति) ॥

Eng: "The determinacy (अध्यवसाया:) which is expressed as "this is jar" is the power of the Highest Lord, beyond name & form. It always Shines as (one with Him) "I" and never as "this"."

केन एतत् उक्तम् .... इत्युक्त : स्त्रियाम् =

Who said that the gross audible indicatory sound is identical with Vimarsha which is the very life of light of Consciousness? That gross sound also shines as other objects. (our view about this Vimarsha is that) Determinacy, which determinately cognises words and objects, characterised by name & form as non-different as, "That is this" is the power of the Highest Lord, called "Vimarsha". It always shines as unlimited 'I' and never as limited 'this'. For, if it were to shine as limited, there will be required still another. Thus it will lead to argumentum-ad-infinitum. Therefore, the external objects, being without anything to rest on, would not shine at all. Therefore, no Vimarsha is separate from Prakāsha. The gender of the word "adhyavasā" is feminine. It is formed by adding affix "an" in accordance with the rule आतश्चोपसर्गे

[Margin notes: तौ = प्रसिद्धौ / नामरूपौ = घट / इति नामरूपाभ्यां / [illegible] / [illegible] / पराम्रष्टा तो = [illegible] / करण [illegible] / [illegible] / [illegible] / अध्यवसा — / [illegible] / [illegible] / [illegible] / [illegible] / स्थूल [illegible] / [illegible]]

11

ङ्गा

ननु एवं .... कथं निर्वहेत ?

If all cognitions rest on I-consciousness, then it means they do not touch the objective level. Therefore as association with time & space is possible of at that only which is of the nature of object of knowledge & not of the knower, so there being no connection with time or space, how can various cognitions which are experienced as comming in succession one after the other, either in relation to space or certain aspects of the subject etc be explained? And if there be no order of succession, there will in reality be only one cognition. How then would it be justifiable, to say, as you have said that Lord is full of powers of cognitions & remembrance etc.

[illegible]तिबुाते = तिद्धौ सत्याम् ॥
[illegible]कालादिक्षया [illegible]ज्ञानार्थशापे[illegible] [illegible]स्याकथं स्यात् = क्रातरयैं क्रम [illegible]अनुवात न स्यात् इति[illegible]
निर्वहेत = सिद्धिं गच्छेत् ॥

सत्यम् एवम् .... स्वांशाइव भान्ति, =

True, the universal consciousness (samvid) has no order of or succession. But it has, by virtue of its power, manifested separately various objects of knowledge. And these shine in it, casting their reflection as in a mirror. Therefore, because of the spatial limitations, such distance and proximity and extendedness & unextendedness, constituted by various forms and temporal limitations, such as slow or quick succession, constituted by variety forms involved in

[illegible]धानि = नी.ला-[illegible]द्यो विषया: [illegible]तेषाय: स्वरूप-भेद: तेन कृत: यो देश: [illegible]क्रो हि वस्तु स्वरूप मात्रमेव ॥
[illegible]इत्यादि तथा [illegible]प: क्रिया भेद: [illegible]मात्रेन = आभास मात्रेण न तु परमार्थत:

,घटादि शब्देन ज्ञानार्थंशानां ग्रहणं । निरंशा नामपि सतां स्वांशा इव भान्ति ॥ उपाधि वशेनाकाशांशवदिति भाव: ॥

action of these objects, there appear to be parts of cognition & remembrance & intellectual reaction, though they have no parts.

निरंशानामपि .... भावत: शान्तय इति.

And because of the parts, which shine, there appears to be succession of parts in each of them as well as in their mutual relations. Although temporal relation succession alone is clearly perceptible in cognitions & not the spatial, yet as the cognition of mountain seems to be big and of jujube fruit small to a layman, so the author has referred to spatial succession also. Therefore the succession in cognition, which is perceptible, due to the successive reflections of the external objects, is not unreal, because nothing that shine is so. Therefore, it was right to say "Cog-

nitions etc are the powers of Lord".

By the verse " Because of the power of the Lord, "Maya" difference in the forms of cognitions was explained And by this verse the difference in temporal & spatial limitations is explained. This is the difference (between the subject matter of this verse from that of earlier.

-*- We bow to that Siva, who [is the cause of ...] the objects, which in variety of forms, by separately manifesting the state of identity with His Self are like one solid mass, by means of his power of differentiation;* which is like a chisel.

अथ षष्ठमाह्निकम्

— o —

स्वात्माभेदघनान्भावांस्तदपोहनटङ्कतः
छिन्दद्यः स्वेच्छया चित्ररूपकर्त्तृं स्तुमः शिवम् ॥

& which is helper of both is going to be discussed at length.

Thus the powers of knowledge & remembrance have been explained. Now the power of differentiation (Apohan-Sakti) in eleven verses beginning with "The universal Consciousness, which is essential nature of light of consciousness" and ending in "Are established to belong to all living beings".

स्वात्मनः = प्रकाशरूपात् स्वस्मात्, यः अभेदः = भेदराहित्यम्, स्वस्मिन् तादात्म्येनावस्थानमिति

तेन घनान् = एकपिण्डरूपान् घटादीनिव मृदन्तः,

भावान् = ग्राह्यग्राहकरूपान् जडाजडान् पदार्थान्,

ते = भावाः, अपोह्यन्ते = स्वतोऽन्योन्यतश्च भेदेन भास्यन्ते अनेनेति,

तदेव टङ्कम् = पाषाणदारणे करणम्, → chisel

ततः = तेन, छिन्दन् = स्वतोऽन्योन्यतश्च भेदेन भासयन्

तदुभयानुग्राहिणी = which is the helper of both.

"अहं प्रत्यवमर्शो यः प्रकाशात्मा" = The universal Self-Consciousness, which is the essential nature of the light of consciousness.

"सिद्धः सर्वस्य जीवतः": are established to belong to all living beings.

'प्रत्यविमर्शो ऽविकल्पो विशेषः' = The distinctive feature of the universal Consciousness is indeterminacy.

स्वदृष्टावेव = That such Self Consciousness has been established on rational basis in our system only.

तदुपपत्तिः = अहं प्रत्यवमर्शोऽप्रोहनव्यापारोपपत्तिः,

अनुसंधानस्य = unification also is determinacy.

एवं भूतानुसंधानादिरूपमेव ..... स्रष्टृत्वम् = asserts that the creative activity of the Lord consists in the unification etc as represented above.

तत प्रकृत .... श्लोकेन = ~~That the same objective manifestation appears in a variety of ways~~ Then in one verse the conclusion that all objective manifestation have their being in the universal-Consciousness which is under discussion.

"तस्यैव .... वैचित्र्यमुच्यते = That the same objective manifestation appears in a variety of ways in the direct cognition & remembrance.

तदुक्तिश्च .... इति श्लोकेन = The last verse says that what has been stated above is useful in recognising the identity of Self the individual self with the Lord.

योजनाकृतम् = शब्दयोजनाकृतम् - स्वाम् स्वभावमवभासस्य विमर्श ..... = "The essential nature of light of Consciousness is free Consciousness (vimarsha).

शुद्धेऽपि = विकल्प- असत्यपि

तस्य = विकल्पस्य तत्र .... मायात्मन्युपपत्तेः = And vimarsha has been related to subtle speech. This emphasises that the pure Lord or universal Consciousness is of the nature of speech. This is not welcome because it is related to determinacy (vikalpa) because determinacy arises only in the world which is of the nature of Maya.

अहं प्रत्यवमर्शो यः प्रकाशात्मापि वाग्वपुः
नासौ विकल्पः सत्युक्तो द्वयाक्षेपी विनिश्चयः

॥ १ ॥

योजना: अहं प्रत्यवमर्शः, यः प्रकाशात्मा वाग्वपु अपि (स्वभावभूतः सन्) असौ विकल्पः (अपोहन-समुत्पन्नं ज्ञानं) न (भवति), स द्वयाक्षेपी (धराधरयोर्द्वयो र्हीनयोर्मध्य एकः प्रतियोगि-निषेधपूर्वो) निश्चयः उक्तो हि ॥

Eng: "The (universal) "I" Conscious, though it the very life of the light of Consciousness & is/embodied in the transcendental speech, is not determinacy, because determinacy is certainly which implies two".

शुद्धा = संवेद्यानुषिता, या संवित् = आन्तरं संवित्त्वम्,
देहादिसंपर्कैरनाविलीभूतस्य = and which is not soiled by association with body etc. सारूपं यस्य तादृशस्य
जीवित् = एतेन षष्ठीतत्पुरुषत्वमस्य द्योतितम्,

अहं प्रत्यवमर्शः = शुद्धे प्रकाशरूपे स्वात्मनि स्थितत्वात् "अहम्" इत्येवं रूपः न तु भावविषयत्वेन "इदम" इति रूपः:

The (universal) "I-Consciousness — which rests on freedom, the chief characteristic of which is perfect independence of others; which is of the nature of inner Consciousness and is without any break, — is the very life i.e. the most essential characteristic of the light of Consciousness, which is of the nature of pure Samvid and is not soiled by association with body etc. & this cannot be determinacy.

प्रत्यवमर्शः, प्रति = आन्तरत्वेन, अवमर्शः = सूक्ष्म अभिलापेन स्पर्शनम् 'अहं' इति प्रत्यवमर्शः ॥

विशेषणान्याह — 'विच्छेदशून्यः"

अन्तरभ्युपगमकल्पः = स्वात्मनि यः स्वात्माङ्गीकारस्तद्रूपः, न तु बाह्याभ्युपगमतुल्य इति कल्प ग्रहणम्,

तत्र या विश्रान्तिः = आस्वादरूपो विश्रामः सारूपं यस्य तादृशः

बीजं = हेतुम् =

विकल्पत्वाशङ्कायां बीजं दर्शयति— = He shows reason to justify the supposition that it is not determinacy namely, "Even though it is embodied in speech".

वाग्वपुरपीति ----- = By the word "vak" is meant that sound which is of the nature of inner speech, is one with Samvid, ever shining within and is different from that sound which is of the nature of an object and as such can be perceived through sense of hearing.

संवित इति = तत्र प्रकाशमात्रनिष्ठत्वेन तच्छरीरविश्रान्त इत्यर्थः
ननु तर्हि वाग्रूपोऽसौ न स्यादित्यत आह "शब्दन" इति —
"अभिलाप" इति

वागित्यनेनोक्तः ..... = vak is so called because it speaks of the object by superimposing itself on the through unification, namely "that is the". But if it is embodied in speech by why then is it not determinacy. The reply is because i.e. it the characteristic of determinacy is absent

स्वाध्यासेन = अयं घटः इति हि घटशब्दाध्यासपूर्वं घटशब्दार्थो निश्चीयते ,

सोऽयमित्यभिसंधानेन यः = यः घटशब्दवाच्यः सोऽयं पुरःस्थितो भव भावो भवति, योजनया इत्यर्थः ।

एतेनात्र वाच्यवाचकसंकेतकरणहेतोरान्तरस्य परामर्शस्यैव वाक्त्वमुक्तम्, न तु बाह्यस्य स्थूल शब्दस्य ॥ *

(That is as follows:— determinacy is the act of construction by many images in consequence of what with one object) and then differentiating the object of cognition from all else, which it was at first doubtful to be, namely involved. Indeterminacy is due to the fact that on sense contact with fire there arises the idea of possibility of not-fire; it is superimposed (on fire at first) and then rejected.)

तेन = ततः कारणात्, विकल्पे = विकल्पविषये,
तद्य = विकल्पविषयद्वयमध्ये पुरःस्थितं वस्तु च, [illegible] द्व्यरूपत्वम्.
निश्चेतव्यम् = अस्तित्व निश्चयार्हं भवति ॥

* Therefore in determinacy there is always differentiation of what the object of cognition is from what it is not.

→ लिङ् — 1. → संभावना:

भिन्नयोरवभासो हि स्याद्घटाघटयोर्द्वयोः ।
प्रकाशस्येव नान्यस्य भेदिनस्त्ववभासनम् ॥
॥२॥

योजना:- (कदाचित् भिन्नयोः घटाघटयोः द्वयो (विश्वयोः) अवभासः स्याद् हि, प्रकाशस्य इव तु भेदिनः (प्रकाशभिन्नस्य) अन्यस्य (अप्रकाशस्य) अवभासनं न ॥

Eng: " There is possibility of appearance (at the same place) of both jar & not-jar, which are essentially different from each other. But there is nothing which has similarity with the light of Consciousness and which being different from it, yet shines.

(margin: due to imperfect perception)

घटे हि .... 'लिङ् संभवानायम्' = There is possibility of presence at that very place, where we see a jar, of something which is altogether different from jar, say, cloth, which also occupies places admitted by fit for it, gives rise to cognition and has been (may have been) brought there by a fixed set of causes. Therefore, there being the possibility of appearance of both jar & cloth (at the place where jar alone is present) there is room for superimposition. When there is superimposition of a thing of different nature (on jar) then alone there is room for the power of differentiation (Apohana) to function

(margin: Apohana = pause — [illegible])

Dreams:

It so happens that there appears manifestation of both jar & non-jar, which are essentially different from one another (भिन्नयोरवभासः) (in place of one and the same object) due to imperfect perception, and the perceiver determines or ascertains it to be the manifestation of one object as different from another), but nothing else shines like the light of Consciousness (Subject), which is different from that (i.e which is not light) (प्रकाशस्येव न अन्यस्य भेदितस्य तु अवभासनम्).

in refuting what is superimposed. Therefore, the ascertainment "this is jar" has the distinctive feature of determinacy, which depends upon the operation of the power of Apohana. Here Lin is used in the sense of possibility.

यस्त्वयं प्रकाशो .... येन द्वितीयः प्रकाशात्मक-
स्यादपोह्येतेति ॥ =

But that which can possibily be superimposed on the light of consciousness cannot be non-light for superimposition is always of something that belongs to the same category & the "not-light" has never been found to have the causal efficiency of the light of consciousness. For, the very fact that it is superimposed or is thought to be possible, would mean that it is not-non-light. Therefore, there is nothing like 'not light' similar to the light of consciousness which may be on par with the latter and whereupon the power of Apohana can function. As there is no 'not-light', so what can be refuted.? Even if "not-light" be supposed to shine or exist (then it is no 'not-light') rather that is also light of consciousness. Nor has the light of consciousness any temporal, spatial or formal differences so as to make it possible to differentiate one light form of consciousness from the other.

हीति .... न तु विकल्पः =

'Hi' means because it is so (because there is nothing to similar to the light of consciousness) and consequently because

there are not two; therefore the differentiation being impossible, it (अहं प्रत्यवमर्शः) can not be represented to be of the nature of vikalpa.
- Therefore, in the case of pure Samvid, which is free consciousness itself, the "I-Consciousness" is the "Self-Consciousness" (प्रत्यवमर्श) only and not determinate Cognition (vikalpa).

घटस्थाने एव = घटविषये एव, घटरूपतयेति यावत्। योग्यः = तदवस्थाने योग्यताभाक् यो देशः →

→ देशः = पदार्थव्यक्तिरूपः देशः, स एवाभिमते स्थाने तस्य यदाक्रमणं तदेव द्वीतं यस्य ता- दृशः

संभाव्येत = तावत्तादात्म्याभावग्रहणात् स्यात्.

संभावन- विषयतां नीयेत.

अतः = अवभास संभावनाया हेतोः समारोपः = अध्यासः

निषेधनलक्षणः = अघट निषेध करण स्वभावः युक्ति इति शेषः.

तदनुप्राणिता → अपोहनदत्तसत्ताका, अतः निषेधपरस्य निश्चयस्यैव विकल्पत्वादिति भावः

[घटग्रहणकाले भिन्नयो - स्फुटं भेदेन स्थितयोः द्वयोर्घटाघटयोरभासः स्यात् - तत् एव अपोहनार्थमत्र विकल्पो युक्तिं भवति॥

तस्य = प्रकाशस्य, स्थाने - विषये

नाप्रकाशरूपो भवेत् इति आह तुल्य इति-

तुल्यकक्षस्य - सदृशावस्थस्य, प्रतियोगिन

(आदिशब्देन व्यवच्छेद ग्रहणम्, तस्य वशात्)

विघटेत = नश्येत्॥

तत्तुल्य प्रकाशस्य = प्रकाशेन सह तुल्यकक्ष्यस्य.

नास्ति → नहि प्रकाश ग्रहण समये तमो ऽपि ग्रहणे संभवतीति भावः

तदभावे = अवभासाभावे

परिनिष्ठितम् = स्वाकारमात्रेऽवसानं गतम्, रूपं यस्य ता दृशे,
तद्दर्शनम् = घटानुभवम्, उपजीवता = अपेक्षाविषयतां नयता
अ कुतो न क्रियत इत्यत आह "अघट" इति, सदृशादर्शनादेव
हि वासना प्रबुध्यते न च घटोऽघटसदृशः प्रत्युत विलक्षण
इति भावः
एवम् = अनेन प्रकारेण,

Here it may be asked: how can the determinate perception of jar, which arises on the basis of indeterminate perception, negate not-jar? For, nobody has mentioned even its name. And how can the residual trace of not-jar arise on perception of jar? (The reply is) True. But this is to be asked from the Budhist and not from us. The reason is as follows:

तदतत्प्रतिभाभाजा मात्रैवाद्व्यपोहनात् ।
तन्निश्चयनमुक्तो हि विकल्पो घट इत्ययम् ॥३॥

योजना:-
'तद्' - 'अतत्' - प्रतिभा-भाजा' (अन्तर्लीनं तद्-अतत-अर्थ-आभासः यस्मिन् तेन) मात्रा (प्रमात्रा) एव 'अतद्' वि-अपोहनेन 'तत्' निश्चयनम् 'अयं घटः' इति विकल्पः हि - उक्तः

Eng: "The certainity about "this" that the subject in whom both "this" and "not this" shine, feels, because he rejects "not this", is spoken of as the determinate cognition "this is jar".

*½ the Subject, while manifesting the activity of Māyā, splits this perfect being i.e. manifests it as delimited. Through that (manifestation of activity of Māyā) he differentiates jar from not-jar, self from cloth etc.

इह प्रमाता नाम .... सर्वार्थावभासः = According to this system, the Subject is different from means of cognition. He is perfectly free in the sphere of cognitions. He is a free agent because he is responsible for unification + differentiation of cognitions. This has been proved and all the objects shine within that Subject.

(margin: The differentiation consists in negation. And we speak of certainty about the jar, "this jar + nothing else" on the basis of that very differentiation only, the chief characteristic of which is negation.)

‡. चिन्मात्रशरीरोऽपि .... न्यायेनास्ति = These objects are essentially of the nature of pure consciousness only, and shine as one with the Subject, exactly in the manner a city shines in a mirror. —*.

(margin: *. This also has been stated. Thus, both the images of "this" i.e. "jar" and of "not-this" i.e. "not jar" are present within the Subject. Thus, therefore in the state of indeterminateness jar is one with pure consciousness and like the latter it is omniform & perfect. Hence it can be of no use in practical life. foreit 2 परिच्छेदः — The chief characteristic of which is negation.)

विश्वशरीरः पूर्णः = भावराशिः, शरीरे यस्य सः, अत एव पूर्णः

तेन = विश्वशरीरेण घटेन,

मायाव्यापारम् = भेदनरूपं मायातत्त्वसंबन्धिनं व्यापारम्,

भावम् = घटरूपम्, तेन = मायाव्यापारोल्लासनेन,

आत्मनः = चिन्मात्ररूपात् स्वस्मात्

परादेव च = स्वान्तर्गतात् घटात् च,

अपोहनम् — कीदृशम्, निषेधनरूपम् = निषेधकरणरूपम्,

विनिश्चयनम् = निश्चयकरण, ‡

अपरं वस्तु = अघटरूपं वस्तु, एष एव = अपोह एव

परितः = अभितः

तक्षणात् = भेदेन भासनादिति यावत्।

‡ एव = The meaning of the word ('eva') is the negation of all other things which can possibly exist (at that place). This determinacy (vikalpa) is so called because it cuts a thing off or

प्रमाणात् = प्रमाकरणात्, प्रमासु = प्रमाणसाध्येषु ज्ञानेषु

स्वतन्त्रः कर्ता इति योजना, न तु हेतुकर्तेति भावः,

आधानम् = संपादनम् । तेन = चिद्भागशरीरेण सामानाधिकरण्येन = एकतया वृत्तिर्यस्य सः।

अस्ति = ततो भेदेन स्फुरति

तदविकल्पदशायां चित्स्वभावः = "प्रागिवार्थः" इति न्यायेन चित्स्व-

विश्वम् = भावराशिः, शरीरं यस्य सः॥ रूपः

तेन = विश्वशरीरेण घटेन

मायाव्यापारम् = भेदेन रूपं मायातत्त्वसंबन्धि व्यापारम् ।

भावम् = घटरूपम् ।

आत्मनः = स्वस्मात् । पृथक् = स्वान्तर्गतादर्थाद्‌ च

कीदृशम्? निषेधनरूपम् = निषेधकरणरूपम् or निषेधकरणम्,

संकीर्णतानिवारणेन स्वात्ममात्रमेव तत्र स्फुरत् अवस्थापनमिति यावत्।

अपरवस्तु = अघटरूपं वस्तु

एष एव = अपोह एव, परितः = अभितः,

P.T.O. परस्मात् अन्योन्यतश्चेति यावत्

हेतु = हेतुद्वयम्

अघटमिति → अघटमित्येतद्वस्तु
घटो विनष्टः भवति, विनष्ट एव भवतीति
यावत्॥

अथमत्र संक्षेपः =

हि = यस्मात्, तदतत्प्रतिभाजा = स्वान्तःकृत-
भावराशित्वेन, तन्निश्चयनम् = घटनिश्च
- यनं कर्म, पंडितैः, कुतूभिः "अयं घटः"
इति विकल्पः उक्तः, अतो द्वयग्रहणमत्र
संभवत्येव येन पूर्वोक्त वस्तुनः संभव इति
भावः

'ज्ञात्रा' इति कर्तरि तृतीया॥

Bodhas also ehevve Said → See boxle note below

अत्र च प्रवर्तेत्यनेन प्रमातुः कथनम्,
~~स्वयमित्यनेन विभजनरूपस्य प्रत्यवशीस्य~~
तत्संबन्धित्वे विभजनस्य च प्रत्यवमर्श-
त्वे स्फुटमेवेति युक्तम् उक्तं प्रवर्तेति
स्वयमिति चेति॥

all sides (from every thing else). The implication of word "हि" is "because it is so. Therefore it is rightly said that determinacy depends upon two.

इति श्लोक त्रयेण महावाक्यार्थः = This is the central meaning in the long sentence, but that extends over three verses.

प्राक्यैरपि .... कथं समर्थयेः : By the Buddhas also the differentiation is represented to be an act of subject. For, in the verse "एकप्रत्यवमर्शी स्फुय" etc they use the words "प्रपञ्चीति" and "स्वयम्". But how can they support this assertion.

ननु एवम् अहमितिपि .... नस्यात् =
But why cannot I-consciousness be represented to be determinacy inasmuch as, in this also jar etc, which are not I have to be negated? The Author on this says.

चित्तत्त्वं मायया हित्वा भिन्न एवावभाति यः।
देहे बुद्धावथ प्राणे कल्पिते नभसीव वा॥४॥

Eng: प्रमातृत्वेनाहमिति विमर्शोऽन्यव्यपोहनात्
विकल्प एव स परप्रतियोग्यवभासजः॥५॥

योजना :-

चित्तत्वं (एव) मायया हित्वा 'अहम्' इति विमर्शः यः अन्यापोहनात् (व्यपोहनेन) देहे बुद्धौ प्राणे अथवा कल्पिते नभसि इव (एव) अनावृतत्वेन भिन्न एव अवभाति, स विकल्प एव, (यस्मात् - यतः) (स) पर- प्रतियोगि अवभासजः (भवति) (अर्थात् - यतः स प्रतियोगि- निषेधात् जायते).

Eng: "The I-Consciousness - which shines as a distinct Subject, because the Universal Consciousness has obscured itself through its power of Māyā and shines distinctly within (the limitations) body, intellect, & pranas or the supposed voidness — is determinacy (विकल्प); Because of its differentiation from others. Determinacy (vikalpa) owes its being to the awareness of another thing, which is of opposite nature".

विश्वाभिन्ने = परमशिवदशायामिव, स्वच्छात्मनि = सदाशिवादि- दशायाम् ॥

विश्वच्छाया → विश्वस्य = इदन्ताग्रहणयोग्यस्य वेद्यराशेः, या छाया - प्रतिबिम्बः, तेन छुरितः = रूषितः यः स्वच्छात्मा = श्री सदाशिवादि रूप आत्मा तस्मिन् ॥

व्यवच्छेदेन = अपोहेन

चित्तत्वे .... न तु शुद्ध प्रत्यवमर्श मात्रम् =

*Chit tatva means that which is of the nature of pure light. "Hitva" means "giving up" — means that though it is still there, yet having thrown

अहमित्यवमर्शो ... छिद्या ......इति वाक्यार्थः :- The I-Consciousness is of two kinds, one is pure and the other is due to Māyā. Pure is that which rests on pure Samvid which is non-different from the universe, or on that pure Self, in which the whole universe is reflected. Impure is that which rests on body etc. which is objective. Thus in relation to pure self-consciousness there is nothing of opposite nature possible, which has to be negated; because jar etc. also being essentially of the nature of consciousness and, therefore, of not opposite nature, have not to be negated. Thus there being nothing to be differentiated from the Self, there is no possibility of determinacy in pure self-consciousness. But the impure self-consciousness — which rest on body etc, which are of the nature of an object and exist separately from other bodies and jars etc. — is undoubtedly a determinacy. This is the substance. The word meaning is as follows:- *

अत्र हेतुः — ...... — समारोपलक्षणः = para means anything i.e. body and garb etc. which are of opposite nature, i.e. of equal status and opposite because they (self and not-self) are mutually exclusive. The limited self-consciousness is determinacy, because the consciousness [goes] into back ground through the influence of Māyā.

"I am fat and not, our identity with garb etc." In the differentiated' (भिन्ने) means 'in the body' etc.

[Margin: arises from that cognition which is characterised by superimposition of what is of opposite nature and depends upon the negation of "not that".]

That determinate consciousness "I am fat" which is due to the wrong notion that I who am body etc. am the perceiver of external objects blue etc., is really determinacy (vikalpa). It is not pure self-consciousness. The reasons are :- ⊕

समारोपलक्षणः = अन्यत्रान्यारोपणरूपं ज्ञानमित्यर्थः, which is characterised by superimposition of what is of opposite nature.

अतन्निषेधेन, अनुप्राणितः = उत्थापितः, ← and depends upon the negation of "not that". (self + not self) are mutually exclusive.

असौ = The limited self consciousness (अहं) — is determinacy.

.... प्रमातृताभिमानः =

⊕ The obscuration of pure Samvid is the cause of difference of body etc. And the cause of obscuration is that power which is called Māyā. It is the power of freedom of Lord. It is freedom to bring about the obscuration of unity, which is of the nature of illusion. It is simply His will to conceal Himself. And the obscuration of real nature of Samvid consists in wrongly considering body etc which are still of the nature of object and therefore different from the subject, to be the subject, without any reason for it.

तदर्थमाह "कल्पिते" इति ...... to end := The implication of the word "imagined" — (कल्पिते) is that as soon

the objective nature of body etc, is realised another Subject which is nothing more than the Void (Shunia) is imagined. The same being the case with this also another Shuniya is supposed and so on; because so long as duality persists the chain of suppositions does not break. This however does not mean infinite regress. For, all, body & intellect etc possess the essential nature of Subject, just because of the presence in them of the power of real light of Consciousness, but not independently. Thus the conception of body as the Subject is mere egoism (अहंकारः). Shuniya (as Subject) is nothing more than universal Consciousness in a limited form; just as not being or absence of jar (घटाभावा) is more than than limited piece of (bare) land. Intellect, Prana, body etc (as Subjects) as nothing more than the universal Consciousness, affected by the reflection of objects, after it has assumed limitation. These Subjects constitute the various levels in the Spiritual accent of Yogins. They are called by different names in different Agamas, such as Jagrat or pindastha etc.

The obscuration shall be explained later as follows:-

" The Sentiency or Consciousness, which is associated with limited Subject such as Shuniya etc, which are in themselves insentient; but in which the element of freedom predominates because it is revived by "Kalā", is limited & occupies a Subordinate position."

Therefore, it is established that impure I- Conciousness is determinacy. [5]

द्विविधोऽपि - - - - - - अशुद्धो द्विविधः = each of the two types of self-consciousness is again subdivisible into two, according as it is of the nature of direct experience or of unification. pure self-consciousness (of the nature of direct experience) is अशुद्धोऽपि तु - - - - - - - तस्य व्यामोहं व्यपोहयितुमाह =

"Aham" or "I" in the Sadāśiva stage. And it is of the nature of unification "I am this" in the state of Sadā-Śiva. Impure self-consciousness is similarly of 2 types (I) that which is of the nature of direct experience "I am fat" and (II) that which of the nature of unification "I who fat am now thin" or I was a child, am now young or old" etc.

In the case of impure self-consciousness, which is of the nature of unification, there being consciousness of unity, some one might consider it to be an indeterminate cognition. It is therefore to remove his ignorance that the author say as follows :-

कादाचित्कावभासे या पूर्वाभासादियोजना ।
संस्कारात्कल्पना प्रोक्ता सापि भिन्नावभासिनि ॥६॥

योजना: कादाचित्क-अवभासे संस्कारात् (पूर्व-अवभास-स्थिति-लक्षण-संस्कार-आश्रिता) या पूर्व-आभासादि योजना, सापि कल्पना (प्रत्यभिज्ञाख्या) प्रोक्ता, (यतः सा) भिन्न-अवभासिनि (विषये) वर्तते ॥

Eng: The association of a distinct cognition, at any time, with the previous one, which takes place due to the past impressions (in the case of a limited subject) is also called Kalpana (determinate knowledge) (particularly named pratyabhijñā) because it is also related to that (body etc) which shines separately as limited subject (सापि भिन्नावभासिनी).

It has been established that vikalpa is not possible in the case of pure consciousness. The or impure self-consciousness which is of the nature of direct experience has already been demonstrated to be of the nature of unification determinate knowledge.

or - - - -

Connecting of the determinate present stage with the previous one, which is due to the revival of impressions (in the case of limited subject, who has definite temporal, spatial and formal limitations) is also determinacy (vikalpa), because it is related to (the body) shining separately as limited.

In the case of impure consciousness which is of the nature of unification there being consciousness of unity, some one might consider it to be an indeterminate cognition. It is therefore to remove his ignorance that the author says as follows :-

Body etc is the taken over from over the previous verse. In the case of the body etc, — the characters of which is determinacy and which appears at a certain time, with temporal & spatial limitations, — the unification of the present with the previous manifestation (Abhāsa) such as body of childhood eg. "I who was a child, am to-day a young man". is determinate knowledge & not pure*

कादाचित्क = at a certain time.

अनुसन्धानात्मा = योजन रूप., अशुद्धस्यापि भेदद्वयं कथाति "अहं स्थूलं", इति.

"तत्र = शुद्धाशुद्ध मध्ये.

अभेदस्य = "योऽहं स्थूलोऽभूवं सोऽहं कृशः" इत्यादि प्रत्यभिज्ञारूपस्यैकस्य,

व्यपोहितुम् = छेदयितुम्

&c "स्थविरो भवितास्मि" — shall grow old.

"Adi" implies unification with the coming stage also.

-*- pure self consciousness - Here the use of the word "Adi" implies unification with the coming stage also ie "shall grow old".

अत्र ----------- भिन्ने हि कथमनुसंधानम्?

*B Here the adjunct of body etc (Bhinavbhasine) is given as the reason (in support of the above statement), namely "because even at the time of unifying of the two stages ~~be accompanied with the Consciousness~~ the body shines separately". For if this unifying of 2 stages be accompanied with the consciousness of its all round perfection ie its freedom from all limitations, then it would be Sadashiva stage and consciousness would assume the form of "I am this". Who can say that determinate consciousness is possible in this case; because in this unification there is no consciousness of separation?

इति चेदाह संस्कारात्" ...... अयमपि विकल्प एव =

But how is this unification possible in the Case of Separate limited Subject?. Reply is - "because of impressions" i.e. because of Remembrance, due to the revival of impressions, Caused by former experiences. In the Case of the Subject, as 'prāṇa' this unification of 2 Stages is based on feelings of Strength and weakness. In the Case of Budhi as Subject, it is based on varying degrees of Knowledge & pleasure etc. and in the Case of Shunya it depends on the Consciousness of its extensive & intensiveness. This is also Vikalpa.

एवं "स एवायं घट" .... गुरवः = Similarly in the Cases of 2 Stages of a jar also, "This is that very jar" determinacy has to be admitted. But as in all these unifications the power of knowledge (विज्ञानशक्तिः) flashes predominently, like lightning, therefore, these are admitted by teachers to be the first step in getting Contact with the Supreme.

देहादीनां पूर्वापर प्रमातृवेद्यता = प्राणस्य देहे वेद्यभावः बुद्धेश्च प्राणे इत्यादिरूपा,

न च भवति, तदवच्छिन्नताभावस्य तद्वत कल्पितत्वादिति भावः

येन = यथा पूर्वं प्रमातारं प्रति वेद्यतया, प्रमातु = परप्रकाशं प्रति प्रमातृतया कल्पितस्य ~~नभस्य~~ नभसः,

परप्रकाशे = बुद्धि प्रमातृ प्रकाशाभावे सति,

प्रमेयम् = परप्रकाशात्मकं प्रमेयम्, न भवति = स्वयम् सिद्धस्य परसिद्धि प्रवृत्त्ययोगात् ॥

.... इति दर्शयति =

The body etc. (as subjects) are not the objects of higher and higher Subjects so that the shining of a particular object of knowledge will not be possible without shining ~~shown~~ of the subject of that, and the latter will not be possible without the light of another still & so on ad-infinitum. Rather the fact is that the statement that the pure light of consciousness illumines the whole universe, implies that Lord is never without the powers of creation etc. The author proves it as below :--

तत्प्रकाशश्च = बुद्धिप्रमातृप्रकाशश्च, पूर्व प्रकाशं विना = प्राण प्रमातृ प्रकाशं विना न भवति,

सोऽपि = प्राण प्रमातृ प्रकाशश्च, प्रमात्रन्तर प्रकाशं विना = देहप्रमातृ प्रकाशं विना न भवति,

time of spiritual intuition, represent the Subject to be above the entire mass of Unknowables, essentially of the class of un-knowables and similar to ether (Nabha) in respect of voidness and yet different from ether which is one of the five elements. This is the view of the Sankhyas etc, who believe in Sunya-Bhavana.

Accordingly, the Charvakas, who represent those who wrongly suppose the body to be the Self, hold that body, with consciousness as its attribute, is Self. Thus, according to them, body is the chief thing, because such is the idea of women children and the ignorant.

Some followers of the Vedanta, who are better than the Charvakas, maintain that the body is transient, because certain new qualities (colour etc) arise in it and change on account of its subjection to heat. And because they find that without the presence of the vital air (prana) in the body, hundreds of deformities enter into it, they hold that vital air, which is responsible for feelings of hunger + thirst, is the Self. Those who are [illegible] still, such as followers of Kanada etc, seeing that vital air also, being transient, cannot possibly remember, hold that Budhi, which is the substratum of knowledge and pleasure etc, is the self.

Others, holding Budhi also to be a lower principle inasmuch as it appears [illegible] an object at the

D-T-a

पृ० 249 line

तद्‌पहस्तने = प्रकाशरूपत्वस्यापहस्तने
परमेश्वरस्य = महास्वातन्त्र्ययुक्तस्य महेश्वरस्य
मायाशक्ति हेतुर्भवति

मायाशक्तिः कीदृशी ?
स्वात्मन → प्रकाशरूपस्य अच्छादनम् → प्रत्युत जडदेहादिभावेन दर्शनं मितप्रमातृन् प्रति, या रचना सैव रूपं यस्यास्तादृशी, न तु घटादितत्त्ववद् वाह्यप्रमानतया स्थितेति भावः॥

पुनः कीदृशी? → भ्रान्तिरूपम् - न तु परमार्थतया स्थितम्।

चैतन्यविशिष्टः → भूम्यन्तर्गत मध्यमर शक्ति न्यायेन संयोग। शक्ति प्राप्त चैतन्य भूतपंचकमय-त्वेन चैतन्य-युक्तः
कायः पुरुष - आत्मा भवति :

JAN

FRI

न देशो नो रूपं
न च समययोगो न परिमा

न चान्योन्या संगो
न च तदपहानिर्नि
घनता

न चावस्तुत्वं स्यात्
न च किमपि सारं निज-
-मिति

ध्रुवं मोहः प्राभ्येत् इति निरदिप्रात
दर्पणविधिः ॥

SAT
2

[illegible]

SUN
3

[illegible]

श्री आचार्य जी महाराज
आचार्य रामेश्वर जी महा.
[illegible]यानन्द संस्कृत विद्यापीठ
[illegible]नपुर श्रीगर सिंह[illegible]
[illegible]रयंगा.

JAN

MON

14

وکٹو تیرن ریپ تمه ... سدر
لوئ ګی وشو ... آرٹش نہ ستر
کوٹی روپ زرٹش دیوته نم رقم پیسس
منګان حصص انعام به پیهو ګوره دیوس
کیاه [illegible] کیاه دیامه کرانن چهو
او پدیٹے اثرت کیٹ به حاوان جیهو
بٹو روپ ناوان ستته کن لو [illegible] هکتیش
منهاجن حصص انعام به بیهو ګوره دیوس
دین ګی نادار ... به پیزیاګه
پیزه ... نکهمیه ستیت ... به پیزیاګه
کرونا ... جے اشتر سروس
کره تابه منهان حصص انعام به پیهو ګوره دیوس

TUE

5

इति एवम् अनवस्था स्यात् : देहप्रमातुरपि प्रमात्रन्तरापेक्षा-
पातात्, तस्याप्यन्यस्यापेक्षा तस्याप्यन्यस्येत्यादि
रूप अनवस्थानं स्यात्, न च नभउपरि
परप्रकाश इव देहस्याधः कोपि
प्रमातास्ति येनानवस्था न स्यादिति
भावः

It is therefore thus established (इति सिद्धम्) that everything shines within the Self (अन्तराभासाः स्थितेव) in all ... being like remembrance & perception which clearly ... is nothing else which depends upon differentiation.

तदेवं व्यवहारेऽपि प्रभुर्देहादिमाविशन् ।
भान्तमेवान्तरर्थौघमिच्छया भासयेद्बहिः ॥6॥

योजना :- तद् (ततः, तस्मात्) व्यवहारेऽपि प्रभुर् (महेश्वरः, प्रमाता) (मायाशक्त्या) देहादिम् आविशन् अन्तर-भान्तम् - अन्तर - अर्थ - औघम् इच्छया (कर्तृशक्त्या) बहिर् भासयेत (आभासयति) ॥.

Therefore we must admit that, even in practical life the Lord having entered into body etc as individual subject (देहादिमाविशन्) by His free will, manifests externally (by his power of action) the mass of objects, which shine within Him.

यत् पूर्वं .... to end. The assertion, that has been made in the verse, "In body & intellect" etc can be thus justified. How? If in the practical life which is the sphere of Maya, the Lord Himself, who is in reality pure light, be supposed, to make the mass of objects, that shine within Him as "I", externally manifest as "this" by entering into body & vital air etc i.e. manifesting Himself primarily as a limited subject in body & vital air etc by means of his free will, which is nothing more than the power of Maya. Otherwise there will be infinite regress. The Lin Lakara in (Bhasayet)

emphs "reason". The word "api" and 'च' are to be connected with other words than those with which they are found to be connected in the verse. The word (तत्) stands for reason. Because of the statement, that has just been made, the following is established. What is that? — the possibility — that even in practical life i.e. in sale & purchase, in witnessing a performance & in giving an exposition, the Lord Himself, identifying Himself with the bodies & vital airs etc. of Caitra & Maitra etc., manifests externally as separate from each other, that which shines within Him without breaking its internality — is established. At one particular time He (1) brings about identity (identifies Himself) with particular subject (body etc.) (2) terminates identity with another (3) produces continuance of the subject as percipient of jar etc. (4) imposes obscuration by obscuring the perfection which is the essential nature. (5) bestows favour by bestowing perfection in so far as He makes the identity of (subject) shine in relation to limited manifestation (aesthetic object). Thus not only in great creations, great continuances, great annihilations, obscurations due to wrath, and favours in form of initiation & spiritual insight, does the Lord perform five functions, but always in practical life also. This has been asserted in following verses.

The 'Lin' Lakāra in (Bhaskarī) means possibility

"We bow to the Lord, whose diversion is creation, who has repose in the pleasure of Continuance & who is ever satisfied with the food of all the 3 worlds"

" We .... who retains his indeterminacy even though He is at every moment ceaselessly creating the 3- worlds by hundreds of determinate things"

पूर्वम् = "चित्तत्वं मयया हित्वा' इत्यत्र श्लोके

अन्तः = पूर्णप्रकाशान्तः, "स्थित एव" इति,
अन्यथा प्रागिवेत्यत्रोक्तन्यायेन प्रकाशासंभवात्,
प्रकृतम् = आरब्धम्, प्रमेयम् = निर्णेयं वस्तु, कीदृशी
अस्यावुपपत्तिरित्यत आह,
'तेन' इति, एतत् च, "न विना तस्मादिच्छामर्शः
प्रवर्तते"

Now there remains no doubt about this that the objects shine (within the universal Self). What is then the use of thinking about other causes (of the objective world). This is the point in hand which has to be established. To establish it reason has been given that without it (i.e. the shining of objects within) determinate consciousness in the form of desire would be impossible. And by the way, the real nature of Self-consciousness & determinate knowledge (vikalpas) has been explained. Now in order to set the minds of pupils at rest, he concludes by explaining the point in hand as follows :-

कारण एव = स्वसंवित्साक्षितया सिद्धोऽयमित्येव कार्यः
कारणान्तरचिन्तया = बाह्यार्थवासनादिकारणान्वेषणया
प्रमेयं = साध्यम्, उपपत्तिः = युक्तिः "
तत्प्रसङ्गात् = तत्रापि अन्तरर्थावभासोऽसतीति
समर्थनार्थम्॥
प्रकृते = अर्थानामन्तरवभासितत्वम्,

एवं स्मृतौ विकल्पे वाप्यपोहनपरायणे।
ज्ञाने वाप्यन्तराभासः स्थित एवेति निश्चितम्
॥८॥

योजनाः — एवं स्मृतौ ज्ञाने वा अपोहन परायणे विकल्पे वा-
अपि अन्तर - आभासः (प्रमातृ संलीनतया अवभासः)
स्थित - एव - इति निश्चितम् (नात्र संशयः कश्चित्).

Eng: It is thus established (इति निश्चितम्) that everything shines within the Self (अन्तर-अवभासः स्थित-एव) in all experiences, like & remembrance, perception (ज्ञाने) and in determinate knowledge which depends upon differentiation (अपोहन परायणे विकल्पे वा).

इति न किंचित् एतत .... to end = ... then the talk of that jar etc are present within the body, vital air, et intellect, void etc would be meaningless; because the body etc stand apart from jar etc. But the real light of Consciousness is Omnipotent. It is therefore established without any effort that the entire universe is within etc.

न अत्र संशय ...... "यदि" इति ... "अन्तर्घटादि" इति
"आगिकार्थः" इति न्यायेन घटादि अन्तर्भवेदिति योजना,
भवतु ततः किम् इत्यत आह "न किंचित" इति। कथं न
किंचित् इत्यत आह "घटादि" इति। न हि देहान्तः कोऽपि
घटं लभते इति भावः। ननु तर्हि प्रकाशान्तरपि कथं
घटादि स्यादित्यत आह "परमार्थ" इति, "सर्वसह:"
इति सर्व शक्ति युक्तत्वात् अन्यथा सर्व आकुभीवासंभवः

अन्तराभासवर्गस्य = प्रकाशान्तर्गतस्य अहन्तया ग्रहणयोग्यस्य घटाद्याभास समूहस्य,

बहिराभासनम् = बहिर्देशत्वेन स्फुरणम्, "इदम्" इति ग्रहणम्,

आभासभेदः = अनुभवादिति शेषः, उभयत्राप्यान्तरत्वाविशेषादिति भाव,

न च न संवेद्यते = अपि तु संवेद्यत एवेति भावः॥

But if the objects, which shine within, are externally manifested in all cases ie in remembrance and in direct perception etc, what difference then there is between manifestation that takes place in perception & that in remembrance? This difference cannot be denied, because there is clearness in one case a lack of thereof in the other. To answer this he says:-.

किन्तु नैसर्गिको ज्ञाने बहिराभासनात्मनि
पूर्वानुभवरूपस्तु स्थितः स स्मरणादिषु
॥९॥

योजना:- किन्तु तद्-अन्तराभासः (चित्तत्वस्यान्तरावभासः) बहिराभासनात्मनि ज्ञाने नैसर्गिकः (सहज एव) स्थितः स्मरणादिषु स पूर्व-अनुभव-रूपस् तु (पूर्वानुभवात्मा) (अत एव स्मृतिः संस्कारजो दृश्यते).

Eng: But in perception (ज्ञाने) in which the objects are externally manifest, the external manifestation of that which is internal (तद् अन्तराभासः)

ग्राहकत्वभासनम् .... पूर्वानुभवसंस्कारजा ॥७॥ = In the direct perception, this is "nila" which makes what was shining within externally manifest, the external shining of the objects, which are within the Self, is due to freedom (Svatantrya) and not, as in the case of remembrance, due to the impressions caused by another perception. In remembrance, imagination & determinate cognitions, following on the back of direct* perception, the objects blue etc which lie within the subject & are externally manifested, are not due to freedom, but to the impressions created by former experiences.*

is natural (नैसर्गिकी) ie is due to his own Svatantrya and in remembrance the manifestations arise from the former perception.

तत्र संस्कारो नाम .... to end.

Now residual trace is nothing else than continued existence of the experience, in another time also. As this continually existing experience is associated with the limited manifestation, blue etc, so remembrance etc also, being one with the limited manifestation blue etc. shine as such. And for this reason it is that the limited manifestation (the object of remembrance) which is not possible at the time of remembrance, is associated with the time of its former experience (e.g. that jar). Then it shall be declared that remembrance etc are in themselves without any object and their objects are only the objects of perception. It is in this that indistinctness of the object in remembrance etc lies. Thus it is clear that there is difference in manifestation (Abhasa) in perception & in remembrance. External manifestation of the object, which shines within, without intervention of anything (Residual trace), is perfect clearness. And manifestations with the

* ०यवधानेन = संस्कारकृतेनेत्यर्थः , अवम् = भवाराज भ्रान्त ज्ञानादि च समस्तम्

intervention of residual traces, because of its not having taken place at that anytime, is indistinctness.

In reality every determinate cognition (विकल्पः) is made in Atma (Soul) which possesses the potential powers of Knowledge (ज्ञानः) and Action (क्रिया). The ज्ञान शक्ति is that which 'manifests' (प्रकाशरूपा) and क्रिया शक्ति is that which 'evolves' (उल्लेखनरूपः). The former relates to the experience in the internal consciousness and the latter refers to the evolution of manifestations of the external objects.

It is thus established that ज्ञान शक्ति (the cognitive power) of the Supreme Self (स्वात्मा) functions in three distinct forms, as the power of Remembrance, Knowledge & Differentiation, in the whole creation from Brahma to an insignificant insect.

अन्तराभासवर्गस्य = प्रकाशान्तर्गतस्य अहन्तया ग्रहणयोग्यस्य घटादास - समूहस्य, आभासभेदः → अनुभवादिति शेषः.

अन्तरवभासम् = अन्तःस्थित नीलाभासम्.

उत्प्रेक्षणे = इत्यस्य उल्लेखनमर्थः ; बाह्यतया व्यवसायितव्यः = अध्यवसाय विषयः कार्यः

स्वात्मीयः = नैसर्गिकेः

/ पूर्वानुभवरूपः = संस्कारजत्वमर्थः

नीलाद्याभाससंभिन्नः = ग्रहणकाले नीलादिविषयोपरक्तः

तत्तादात्म्यापन्नम् = नीलतादात्म्ययुक्तम् , तथा = पूर्वानुभववत्

अव्यवधानेन = संस्कारव्यवधानरहितत्वेन ॥ ॥

ननु अनुभवज्ञानात् ------ प्राप्तम् ?

But from this theory it will follow that Shining of the objects externally, in all forms of knowledge excepting the direct perception, which is due to the operation of senses is not without the intervention of residual traces.

स नैसर्गिक एवास्ति विकल्पे स्वैरचारिणि।
यथाभिमतसंस्थानाभासनाद्बुद्धिगोचरे ॥१०॥

योजना :- बुद्धिगोचरे यथाभिमत-संस्थान-आभासनात् (स्वतन्त्रस्तु विकल्पः) स्वैरचारिणी विकल्पे स (अन्तराभासः) नैसर्गिक एव ॥.

Eng : " In determinate cognition, which is free in its working, because it can manifest anything in any order in the mirror of Bhudhi, the external manifestation is due to freedom.

यः प्रत्यक्ष०व्यापारम् .... to end.

The determinate cognition in the form of imagination, which is due to mental distraction and is independent of direct perception, is free in its working ie does not require any external prompting in its rise and termination. The external manifestation of blue etc which Shine within this, is due to freedom ie depends on nothing else. For instance, the determinate

Cognition (the manifestation) manifests externally on the background of internal organ, the clear mirror of Budhi, an elephant, which is present within the Subject, and which was never seen before as possessed of white colour, two trunks and hundred tusks. Just at that very time.

अनुपजीवन् = अनपेक्षमाण:

अपरिदृष्टपूर्वम् → कदाचिदपि पूर्वं न दृष्टम्, न हि वक्ष्यमाणगुणो हस्ती कदापि दृश्यते इति भाव:।

श्वेतम् - सितम्, दशनशत कलितम्, न तु दन्तद्वयकलितम्.

दन्तिनम् = हस्तिनम्.

बहि: अन्त:करणभूमौ - प्रकाशापेक्षया बाह्यत्वेन स्थितायामन्त:करणभित्तौ,

कीदृश्याम्? → स्वच्छा या धी: सैव दर्पणम्

शास्त्रे = अस्मिन् प्रत्यभिज्ञाशास्त्रे, अभिसंहितम् = ग्रन्थकारेण मनसि कृतम्,

तत् = प्रयोजनम्,

As a result of this discussion on variety of manifestations, which was entered into, by the way in the course of arguments to prove that the objects shine within the subject, the principal point, the recognition of the Lord in Self, which is here intended to be specially treated, is automatically, without any effort, established.

अत एव यथाभीष्टसमुल्लेखावभासनात् ।
ज्ञानक्रिये स्फुटे एव सिद्धे सर्वस्यजीवतः ॥११॥

योजना:-

(विकल्पस्य) यथा-अभीष्ट-समुल्लेख-अवभासनात् (अपूर्व-अर्थ-निर्माण ज्ञान-सामर्थ्यात्), अत एव सर्वस्य जीवतः ज्ञानक्रिये स्फुटे एव सिद्धे (सर्वस्य सर्वज्ञत्वे सर्वकर्तृत्वे च स्फुटम्)

Eng: "For this very reason, i.e. because of the capacity to manifest in immagination all that is desired, the powers of knowledge and action of all living beings are clearly established."

यत् इदं .... to end.

(1) This very picture up in imagination, of all that is desired, and (2) this objective grasp of the pictured up, — though it has never been the object of experience, because it has no existence in the objective world, which has been explained, by the way, — establishes this also that to all, who are endowed with life, whether whether he be a worm or Brahma, the power of knowledge, consisting in objective grasp and that of action, consisting in picturing up, are natural. In the kingdom which is a creation of mind, there is no possibility of any dependence upon the already existing separate creation, brought into being by God. Therefore, one's own power of action and that of knowledge, which are characterised by freedom in knowing and doing, have to be clearly ~~understood~~ recognised. The use of singular in "Sarvasya" indicates that all are essentially one with the Lord. ~~The ch~~

शास्त्रे = प्रत्यभिज्ञाशास्त्रे, अभिसंहितम् = ~~अ~~ ग्रन्थकारेण मनसि कृतम्, तत् = प्रयोजनम्, अधिकरणसिद्धान्तनीत्या = यत्रैकाश्रयेणान्यद् वस्तु सिद्ध्यति सोऽधिकरण- सिद्धान्त: यथा शब्दानित्वाश्रये तद्गुणत्वसिद्धि: तस्य या नीति: तया ॥

अवभासनमत्र = विकल्पघनीभावेन पुर: स्फुरणम् ॥

नैसर्गिकी = स्वाभाविकी ×

स्वमैश्वर्यमेव = निजं सहजं स्वातन्त्र्यमेव.

स्फुटं प्रत्यभिज्ञेयम् = तत् ईश्वर विषयम्
ऐश्वर्यम् ममैवेदमैश्वर्यमिति
प्रत्यभिज्ञाविषयो कार्यम्,
फलतः स ईश्वरः अयमहमेवे-
ति प्रत्यभिज्ञा कार्या इति भावः

वि व्यतिरिक्त = स्वात्मनो भिन्नः य ईश्वरः
तेन कल्पिता या;

पूर्वसिद्धा = बाह्य सृष्टिर्वत् मनोराज्ये
पूर्वं सिद्धतया स्थिता या

तस्य यदुपजीवनम् = संस्कार दृष्टि
द्वारेण अपेक्षणं

सप्तममाह्निकम्

अनन्तशक्तिरत्नानां यदेकाश्रयसंश्रयात् ।
विचित्रचन्द्रिकोल्लाससंसिद्धिस्तं स्तुमः शिवम् ॥

अनन्तानि = अपरिच्छिन्नानि, यानि शक्तिरत्नानि = रत्नरूपाउत्तम-वस्तुत्वेन, ज्ञानस्मृत्यादिशक्तिसमूहः तेषाम्,

यदेकाश्रयसंश्रयात् = यश्चासौ एक आश्रय शक्तिमत्त्वेन असाधारणं स्थानम् तस्य अवष्टंभेन

We bow to that Shiva, because of resting on whom, as the only place of rest, the innumerable powers, produce various effects, just as gems do the variegated light.

उन्मीलितम् = प्रकटीकृतम्, न तु निर्णीतम्। समर्थयितुम् = साधयितुम्

अधुना — तासां शक्तीनां यत् संयोजन-वियोजनादि, आदिशब्देन स्वस्मिन लीनीकरणम्, तत्र यत् स्वातन्त्र्यम् = स्वातन्त्र्यम् तस्य योगात्

उभयम् = शक्तियाश्रयस्यैकत्वे महेश्वरत्वञ्च, उपक्षिप्तम् = समर्पितम्

स्वरूपतः = स्वरूपमात्रेन, उपक्षिप्येते = कथ्येते

Thus the real nature of powers of remembrance etc. has fully been described so far. As the essential nature of the subject also has been described here only to that they (remembrance etc.) are powers.

तत्रासामेव शक्तित्वे .... एक आश्रयः = only to prove that (remembrance etc.) are powers. As powers cannot exist independently therefore it is going to be proved that the substratum (resting place) of those powers is one.

स च .... इति यत उभयम् उपक्षिप्तम् = And that is the Highest Lord, because he is free to bring about the union or separation of those powers. He is not simply an inherent substratum as the fire is of the powers of to burn & cook.

Both these points were hinted at in a previous verse "न चेन्न ज्ञाता: ------" "If there be no lord holding the endless universe within" This should now be thoroughly discussed & established & "व्यवहार: सर्वै: सति .... युक्ति: उच्यते" → The next two verses state reasons, both positive & negative, namely that the practical life is possible only if there be one basis & not otherwise, then the essential nature of practical life is presented in terms of causal relation in ×3 "अथ श्लोकार्थो ------ तदाश्रय: ": It has been stated in the last verse of the preceding chapter "it is established that all the living beings have the powers of knowledge and action" But how is that? & what is that which is different from knowledge etc & can possess them? For the Kāṇādic conception of their substratum has already been refuted in "Therefore, even when the qualities change etc" In answer of this question the author gives a clear idea of what that One is according to this system.

या चैषा प्रतिभा तत्तत्पदार्थक्रमरूषिता ।
अक्रमानन्तचिद्रूपः प्रमाता स महेश्वरः
॥१॥

योजना: तत्तत्- पदार्थक्रमरूषिता (तत्तत्- विषय-उपश्लिष्टा, अथवा तत्तत् विषयक्रमे उपरक्ता), या एषा प्रतिभा (संवेदनम्- संवित्तिः), स अक्रम- अनन्त- चिद्रूपः महेश्वरः प्रमाता).

×: In order to establish one basis, another chapter, consisting of 14 verses, beginning with "And that this light" and ending in "practical life is experienced" is begun ×1

×1 Of these the first verse states briefly the essential nature of the one basis

×3 one verse, of remembrance in another and of differentiation between truth & falsehood in 8 verses. The last verse states the conclusion. This is the summary of the chapter. Now the meaning of each verse is going to be explained.

स्फुरति ... इति .... भात्ता = Although in the experience "jar shines" the light of consciousness is related to the object; yet it (the light of consciousness) does not belong to it (the object) as its own essential nature (Svakam vapuh): on the contrary, it is the light of consciousness itself which shines as object; because the object ... Eng: This Consciousness (या च ऐषा प्रतिभा) which manifests itself in varieties of forms of diverse objects (तत्तत् पदार्थक्रमरूषिता:) is the perceiving Subject (प्रमाता), the great Lord (Maheshwara) whose essential nature is unchanging + endless knowledge (अक्रम- अनन्त - चिद्रूपा:).

भात्ता .... बहिः क्रमावभासः समर्थितः॥

Here the present participial affix "भात्ता" indicates ever shining nature. And use of accusative case, the peculiar significance of which in his particular case is लक्षण, indicates the relation of knower and the object of knowledge (between तम् and संविद्). This relation is a product of His power of freedom. And the succession which is expressed externally has been shown thus to be due to His picturing up the objects.

भात्ता = "भान्तम्" इत्यत्र स्थित शतृ प्रत्ययेन, अविरतस्फुरणत्वं द्योतितम् इति संबन्धः, अन्यथा "भातम्" इति ब्रूयात् इति भावः

कर्मप्रवचनीयेन = लक्षणक्रियावाचकेन।

यः — पदार्थानां .... या प्रति उक्ता 'केवलं भिन्नसंवेद्य...) इत्यादिना —

The light of consciousness — which is affected, as mirror is reflected by reflection, by temporal + spatial order, characterised by simultaneity or succession of objects, manifested by the powers of time + space, which are nothing but the power of freedom of Lord, about whom we

(Margin notes: object shines, it brings out the background of subject, e.g. "shines to me". The same idea is found expressed in the Vedas:- "All shines after Him, who is ever shining. All this shines with His light." ... [illegible Devanagari marginalia])

Shall talk soon, — has already been discussed in an earlier verse " only different objects " etc.

एषा इति च .... to end.

And this (light of consciousness) is self-luminous and is therefore manifest to all. In reality it is introvert. And because it is ultimately nothing more than pure light & there is no variety in it, therefore it is without succession. The very light of consciousness is the great Lord whose essential nature is "Consciousness" which is beyond the temporal & spatial limitations. He is called the Subject inasmuch as He is pure light of consciousness. He is full of power of freedom which expresses itself in various ways, such as unifying, differentiating & relating (to) the Subject the mass of knowledge, consisting of determinate cognitions in innumerable forms, referring as 'this' & 'this' to every objective manifestation, which shines within the mass of means of knowledge which are nothing more than the extrovert light of consciousness. Thus the correct

सर्वस्य = समस्तचेतन वर्गस्य

स्वप्रकाशरूपा = स्वसंवेदनसिद्धरूपा

परमार्थश्च = सत्यतश्च

अन्तर्मुखत्वेन = [illegible]

"आगामि" इति प्रमातृतया [illegible]

अक्रमा = देशकालपरिच्छेदरहिता

स्वातन्त्र्यरूपा

सैव = सा [illegible]

तेन = [illegible]

विमर्शात्मा = [illegible]

तत्र = [illegible]

[illegible]

अर्थात् = [illegible]

Answer is "अहमिति" that it is "I" — <u>तदुभयविश्रान्तिस्थानम्</u>

— the resting place of both.

(i) बहिर्घटप्रकाशः "अयं घटः" (i) ~~i.e. indeterminate cognition~~ निर्विकल्पः "~~this is the~~ jar of jar jar as an explained object jar" स्वीकृतपूर्वरूपः — which was the content of former [illegible] ~~(i) indeterminate~~ <u>minate cognition</u> too.

प्रकाशमात्र परमार्थ तया भेदाभावात् अक्रमः

and because ultimately nothing more than pure light and there is no variety in it, therefore it is with-out succession.

सैव महेश्वरः — अविद्यमानोऽन्तः — परिच्छेदो देशतः कालतः स्वरूपतश्च यस्याः चितः संविदः तदेव रूपं यस्य इति

— The very Light of Consciousness is the Great Lord whose essential nature is "Consciousness," which is beyond the temporal & spatial limitations

स प्रमाता भण्यते = He is called subject

In as much as —

शुद्धः ~~[illegible]~~ स्वातन्त्र्य परिपूर्णः = He is ~~full of~~ power of pure light of Consciousness and is full of Power of freedom which expresses itself in various ways such as संयोजन वियोजन अनेकप्रकार

unifying & differentiating

बहिर्मरवं प्रकाशात्मक विज्ञान .....

प्रकाशरूप : → and relating P.T.O.

~~स प्रमाता~~

स प्रमाता भण्यते →

या प्रतिभा उक्ता :-
या = The light of Consciousness which has been discussed in the earlier verse.

सेवरुचिता
-प्रतिबिम्बकल्पतया उपरक्ता, which is affected as mirror is, by reflection; manifested.

क्रम = देशकालपरिपाटी = by temporal & spatial order.

सक्रमयौगपद्यादिविचित्ररूपो यः पदार्थानां = characterised by simultaneity & succession of objects.

वक्ष्यमाणेश्वरस्वातन्त्र्यरूप देशकालशक्त्यु-पकल्पितः = which are nothing but the power of freedom of Lord, about whom we shall talk soon —

एषा इति = And this (light of Consciousness) सर्वस्य स्वप्रकाशरूपा = is self-luminous & therefore manifest to all.

परमार्थतश्च अन्तरमुखैव = In reality it is introvert.

|

from next leaf:—

and relating to the subject the mass of knowledge consisting of determinate cognitions in immutable forms, referring as "this" & "that" to every objective manifestation which shines within the mass of means of knowledge — ~~which~~

बहिर्मुखतया प्रकाशात्मक स्वभाव:)

which are nothing more than the extrovert light of Consciousness.

यतश्च बहिर्घट प्रकाश: "~~सिद्धिरिति~~" "प्रमेय घट" इति →

इति इयत पूर्ण प्रकाशस्य स्वरूपम् = the Correct description of light of

description of light of consciousness is that it is the "I", i.e. resting place of both (i) indeterminate cognition of jar as an external object and (ii) inner determinate cognition "this is the jar", which assumes the form of jar, which was the content of former indeterminate cognition.

[illegible] ...प्रकाशस्य – शुद्ध प्रकाशस्य.

...कृतपूर्वरूप – गृहीत प्राक् ...तीत घटरूप.

तदुभ... [illegible] ...विकल्परूप प्रकाशस्य ॥

केवलम् = विकल्पेतरम्
विवदानाम् = वेद्यवस्तूनां यत् उल्लेखनम् – नहि संवेदोऽपि
क्रीडार्थं स्वातन्त्र्येण विमर्शनम्
तस्य बलात् = वशेन , बाह्य: क्रमावभास: → भिन्नभिन्न पदार्थ-
विषयं क्रमावभासनम्,
देशकालपरिपाटी = एतद्देशस्थोऽयम् एतत्कालगतश्च इत्यादिरूप:
सन्निवेश: , तेन – देशकालक्रम परिपाटेन
उपरक्तो = स्फटिकादिवत् नीलादीना उपरागविषयतो नीला:
स्वीकृतपूर्वरूप: – गृहीत पूर्वकालीन – घटरूप: विकल्प:
तदुभयस्य = घट प्रकाश घटविकल्पयुगलकस्य
विश्रान्तिस्थानम् = लय स्थानम्

तत्तद्विभिन्नसंवित्तिमुखैरेकप्रमातरि ।
प्रतितिष्ठत्सु भावेषु ज्ञातेयमुपपद्यते ॥२॥

योजना:- तत्तद् भिन्नानाम (अनेका) संवित्ति (संवित् स्रोतो) मुखैर (तास्ता: विभिन्ना संविद्; तानि एव मुखानि द्वाराणि तै:) एक प्रमातरि प्रतितिष्ठत्सु (प्रमातृ-सिन्धुम् उपलीय सत्सु) भावेषु ज्ञातेयम् (कार्यकारणतादि-व्यवहार समन्वय:) उपपद्यते ॥

Eng: The mutual relationship of objects is possible only, when they rest together in one Subject facing one another (entering in it) through the channels of different cognitions.

'संविन्निष्ठा हि .... end. It is said that the objects shine distinctly only as resting on Samvid (conciousness) but this shining is not possible if they were to be supposed to be resting on the varying cognitive (pramātmaka) conciousnesses (Samvid) such as the vijiana of the Budhas of the objects, such as blue & pleasure etc be resting (facing one another) in the Ocean of universal Self consciousness

संवित्निष्ठा = संविद् भित्तित्वेन स्थिता

विषय॰व्यवस्थितयः = नीलसुखादिभावमर्यादाः ॥

भिन्नरूप प्रमात्मक संविन्मात्र विश्रान्त्या न सिद्ध्या

= प्रतिक्षणं भिन्नरूपं प्रमास्वरूपम् यत् =

संविन्मात्रम् तत्र विश्रमणेन कथं सिद्ध्यति

तस्मात् नीलसुखादिविषयरूपाः

तानि एव = संविद् एव.

नदीस्रोतः स्थानीयैः = नदीस्रोतः सदृशैः

तैः हि उह्यमाने तृणादि समुद्रान्तः

प्रविशति ॥

उह्यमानाः = जले तृणादिवत् विवशाः तेः

महासमुद्रे = महाप्रकाशरूपे समुद्रे .

प्रतितिष्ठत्सु विश्रान्तिं भजन्ते =

इत्यत्र हि घटः इदन्तारूप संविद् द्वारेण

अहमाख्ये परप्रमातरि एव स्फुटं विश्रान्ति

भजति, ततः परम् "अहम्" स्वरूपे एव

P.T.O. ब्रुडितत्वात्, यत्तु कालान्तरे तस्य पुनर्दर्शने

तत् पुनर्विश्रान्त्यं तस्य पुनस्तत्र विश्रमणात्
एव इति न विरोधः। प्रतीतिस्फुति-
रूपेण भावेन च ज्ञातेयोपत्तिरूप भावलक्षणं
सचेतस्यर्थीभूतं कथयति :

ततः = तद्भावद्वैतुतोः एषु = भावेषु
यज्ञातेयम् = संबन्धः, तत उपपन्या,
घटते = युज्यते

कर्मिच → बान्धवा हि न केवलम् परस्परं
जानन्त्येव किन्तु उपकारपरा अपि भवन्ति इति
भावः॥

तच्च = ज्ञातेयञ्च – इह=अस्मिन् श्लोके
दर्शितम् = इति, लक्षणयेति भावः
(न हि भावानाम् चेतनत्वेन मुख्यार्थ-
संभवः इति परमार्थः)

इति प्रतिपादयितुम् = एतत्सूचयितुम्
इत्यर्थः॥

which is essentially the Subject, having been carried to it through various determinate perceptions, which are comparable to currents of rivers, then alone their mutual relationship can be explained. The word "ज्ञातेयं" is the state of relations. The reason why the word "ज्ञातेयं" is used for relations is that they know one another. It also means the act of relating, which is nothing else than the mutual assistance. In the present context, however the word is used in the sense of unification, in order to show that the insentients cannot get unified themselves.

Now he is going to advance negative argument to assert the same:-

देशकालक्रमजुषामर्थानां स्वसमापिनाम् ।
सकृदाभाससाध्योऽसावन्यथा, कः समन्वयः ॥३॥

योजना:- अन्यथा, देशकालक्रमजुषाम् स्वसमापिनाम् (स्वात्मपरिनिष्ठितमेव स्वरूप अवभासनम् एषां भावानां, अथवा, स्वरूपमात्र प्रतिष्ठानाम्) अर्थानाम् कः समन्वयः? (एषां) असौ (समन्वयः)

Eng:- "How can otherwise mutual connection of the objects which are related to different temporal and spatial orders and are self confined be possible? For, it (connection) depends their shining simultaneously." - in the Subject.

∴ सकृद्-आभास-साध्यः (भवति) (युगपद् एकाभास निबन्धश्च एषां समन्वयः सोऽभिन्नः प्रमातृलीनतया [illegible])

अथीनां जडानां.......... to end =

What connection there can be amongst insentient objects, their indeterminate experiences, determinate cognitions and ascertainments, which remain confined to their respective temporal + spatial orders and are self confined i.e are cut off from one another? This means that no connection is possible. For, this connection can be established only if they shine simultaneously and are unified in one time, place + form. It is possible in no other form. For, straw and grass etc, borne by currents, which lose themselves separately (in sands) at different places never meet.

There is difference in temporal + spatial relations of the objects because of their own diversity. Therefore, the word "सकृत" is used to indicate the idea of elimination of such difference.

उपपत्तिम् = युक्तिम्, अन्वयम् = योजनामात्रम्., जडानाम् = नील - सुखादिरूपानाम्, तत् ज्ञानानाम् = नीलसुखाद्यनुभवानाम्, 'विकल्प' पदेन स्मृत्यादीनामपि ग्रहणम्

सकृदाभास..... 'साधयितुं शक्यः → देशकालाकारैः भिन्नतया स्थितानाम् नीलादीनां केनापि सामान्येन योजनं हि संबन्ध इति भावः

समन्वयम् = परस्पर मेलनम्, अनेनेन = आभासानेकतया. देशकालादि भेदः

तन्निषेधतात्पर्येण = देशकालादि भेदनिषेधतात्पर्येण भवति ॥

"सकृत्" शब्दः प्रयुक्तः, सत्र इति भावः ॥

The teacher now explains the possible Cause of the mutual connection of different things. It is their knowledge or awareness resting in the Consciousness (Subject) that brings about their mutual relation. He says according to the Naiyayikas, the general relation of Cause & effect in diff. things is established in 5 possible ways viz by means of 2 perceptions & 3 non-perceptions:- 'fire'; "Smoke"; absence of Smoke; absence of fire; absence of Smoke. All these 5 means are in themselves confined to their respective spheres, but, since they rest together in one Self-Consciousness, the perceiving Subject (ज्ञाता), so the Causal relation between things can be established by means of these five. It is only when the knowledge of these five premises enter through five Channels of perception and non-perception into one Self-Consciousness, the Subject (ज्ञातृ), as it were the Sea, then resting in it together as

P.T.O.

unified, they become dependent upon one another, in causal relation, through power of freedom (स्वातन्त्र्यः) of the Self, otherwise they will remain unrelated like jar & cloth. The teacher states the same idea in the following Karika :—

तत्र कोऽसौ समन्वयः? ....

But what is this Samanvaya? To answer this question he describes the relation of Cause and effect as follows:-

प्रत्यक्षानुपलम्भानां तत्तद्भिन्नांशपातिनाम् ।
कार्यकारणतासिद्धिहेतुतैकप्रमातृजा ॥४॥

योजना:- प्रत्यक्ष-अनुपलम्भानां (प्रत्यक्षानुपलम्भस्रोतपञ्चकः) तत् तद् भिन्नांशपातिनां (क्रमिकस्वविषयमात्रज्ञापनक्षीणाः-नान्योन्यापेक्ष-उपलक्षणाक्षमाः) (तेषां) कार्यकारणता सिद्धिहेतुता एकप्रमातृजा (तै एकप्रमातृमुखेन समन्वयमागत्य एव उपपद्यते) ॥

Eng:- As perceptions and non-perceptions are confined to their respective spheres which are exclusively their own and are different from the rest, the establishment of the relation of Cause and effect, therefore, depends upon oneness of the Subject.

इह अग्नौ .... धूमाग्न्योः सिद्ध्यति = It has been asserted (by Some Schools) that the Casual relation between the fire and Smoke is established by means of five i.e. two perceptions + 3 non-perceptions. When (1) a person percieves fire (2) He does not see Smoke (3) then he directly perceives Smokes (4) If he does not see fire (5) He does not find Smoke also.

उद्व्यूढम् = उपकृतम् ,

इति .... कथम्? But how can this be?

अग्निप्रत्यक्षेण हि ...... अनावेद्यात्वा इति = For, the perception of fire does not bring into being the perception of smoke in any way, because the fire brings about the perception of only that which is characterised by brilliance and is different from smoke & because it rests on the separate part only alone which has its special characteristics. It does not touch the object of another perception nor does it enter into what constitutes the essential feature of the other perception.

„प्रयोगः = समस्तकार्यकारणभावविषयभागभूते ॥

तस्य = अग्निप्रत्यक्षस्य ।

„प्रवगमहेतुत्वात् = ज्ञानकारणत्वात् ॥

विश्रान्तत्वात् = पातित्वादित्यर्थः ॥

पाति: ज्ञापनवाची पतिश्च ...... प्रयुक्तस्तन्त्रेण = Here the word "pāti" is used in two different sense "to make known" & "to rest". It stands for two words (one derived from the root 'pat' with causal affix & the other without it.

पाति: = ज्ञानहेतुः
पतिः = ज्ञानपद विश्रान्ति करता

प्रयुक्तस्तन्त्रेण = सकृत्प्रयुक्तं युगपदेव बहु...

„तन्त्र शास्त्रे न एक ग्रन्थ इत्यर्थः ॥

एवं धूमानुपलम्भादौ चतुष्टये वाच्यम् = The same has to be said with regard to the remaining four, non-perception of smoke etc.

(interlinear: in one smoke direct perception)

पर विषयानवगाहनात् = धूमज्ञान विषय धूमानव-
गाहनात् ।
तथा ज्ञानान्तरस्थ = धूमज्ञानस्थ यत्स्वरूपं
- तत्र अनावेशात -
ततश्च = इत एव ततः कारणात् च
प्रत्यक्षद्वयानुपलम्भत्रयविषयीभूत वस्तुपंचकम्,
पृथग् यः प्रमाता तस्य वेद्यानि - वेद्यता
गतानि सन्ति, धूमाग्न्योः कार्यकारणतां
न गमयन्ति, नहि परेण गृहीतमग्निं परो
धूमकारण तया गृह्णाति सोपि वा धूमम-
ग्निकार्यतया इति भावः ॥
ननु विकल्पेनैव भिन्नप्रमातृवेद्येषु अग्न्यादिषु
कार्यकारणताग्रहणमस्तु, नहि विकल्पस्य
कुत्राप्य शक्तिः असंभवोपहतेऽपि वस्तुनि
प्रवृत्तेः इत्यत आह " विकल्पोऽपि"
यदा तु प्रत्यक्ष ------ = नदीप्रवाहस्थानीयेन
प्रत्यक्षादि पंचकेन
प्रमाणा = सर्वाधारभूतेन ग्राहकेण,
स्वतन्त्रतया = स्वास्मिन् स्थितया अप्रतिहतया
स्वातन्त्र्य शक्तितया, परस्परं युक्तित्वेन
P.T.O.

अन्योन्यसापेक्षाणि भास्यन्ते, न तु घटपटा-
दिवत निरपेक्षत्वेन भास्यन्ते,

स एक आभासः = द्वयोरमेलनरूप आ-
भासः

कार्यकारणभावाभासः = कार्यकारणभा-
रूपः आभासः भवति

न किंचिदवधम्, किंचिद्दोषोद्भूते न
भवतीत्यर्थः ॥

ततश्च प्रत्यग्नि .... न प्रमाणमेव =

Therefore just as "fire", "absence of smoke", "absence of fire" and "absence of smoke" these five, when perceived by different persons, cannot give an idea of any relation of cause and effect between fire and smoke so they cannot arouse the idea of relation, when they are perceived by the so called the same person perceiver. And the determinate cognition also, which makes known something which is different from the undeterminately cognised, is not valid. (Hence the causal relation cannot be said to be explicable in terms of vikalpa.

यदा तु .... to end.

But, according to our system, when through 5-channels of perception and non-perception these five things enter into one sea, then commingling together they are manifested by the subject through his power of freedom, as unified with and dependent upon each other, but not otherwise, (unrelated) like jar and

cloth. The single manifestation of interdependence is the relation of Cause & effect. Therefore, according to us, every thing is all right.

The pūrvapakshin questions, the Causal relation in different things is established by remembrance, how do you say, then, that it depends on the oneness of the Subject (Pramātā). The teacher replies

* ननु प्रत्यक्षानुपलम्भैः ...... एकीकरिष्यति = But cannot the power of remembrance 'bring together the effects of various perceptions and non-perceptions?

उक्तं .... कथं स्यात् = Reply has already been stated, namely that remembrance also operates on what has been the object of perception and is of the nature of unification of different perceptions. Therefore, remembrance itself is not possible without one Subject. This he shows in the following verse.

स्मृतौ यैव स्वसंवित्तिः प्रमाणं स्वात्मसंभवे
पूर्वानुभवसद्भावे साधनं सैव नापरम् ॥५॥

स्मरण कालेऽपि प्राच्योऽनुभवेन सत्तः स्वसंवेदनात्मा सन्नेव स्मृतिस्वरूप सद्भावावेदक स्वसंवेदनादि भिन्नः प्रकाशेत ॥

योजना :- यैव स स्वसंविति: स्मृतौ स्वात्मसंभवे प्रमाणं, सैव पूर्वानुभव सद्भावे (अपि) साधनं, अपरं (यदेव स्मृति स्वसंवेदनम्, तदेव अनुभवस्य स्वसंवेदनम्, न तु अपरं स्वसंवेदनम् व्यतिरिक्तम्)

Eng: The same Self-Conscious, which make itself Shine in remembrance, is the illuminator of the former perception also & no other.

स्वसंवित्तिः = Self consciousness. ; प्रमाणं स्वात्मसंभवे = which makes itself Shine (स्मृतिसंभवे) (विप्रकाश:)

सैव = स्वसंविद् सैव = That very Self-consciousness.

साधनं = illuminator

नापरम् = no other Self-Consciousness, but the same one which is ever & always present.

इह अनुभूतो विषयः .... एतत् एवमुपपद्येत

In remembrance, the object, which has already been perceived, shines. Here the object is simply remembered. It does not shine as new. That which shines in remembrance, is the former perception itself. But because the perception itself is of the nature of knowledge & not an object, it cannot therefore, be the object of another knowledge, because one knowledge cannot be the object of another, on the contrary, it is self-luminous. Further, if it (being momentary) has no existence at the time of remembrance, how can it shine (so as to become the object of remembrance)? And even it be supposed to be existing, then also these two cognitions, remembrance & perception are different from each other. Therefore remembrance will never be possible. Hence remembrance is possible in the following manner:-

यदेव स्मृतिसंवेदनम् .... to end = The self-consciousness in remembrance is the same as that in perception. There is no-thing else than self-consciousness

उपपद्येत = घटेत
स्वसंवेदनम् = ज्ञातृ
अपरम् = ज्ञातृभिन्नम्
क्रमते = प्रगल्भेत
तत्र = तस्यां स्मृतौ

Registered No. 116 Established 1915 phone No

(काश्मीरी ब्राह्मणों की एकमात्र प्रतिनिधि सभा)

ब्राह्मणमहामण्डल काश्मीर

BRAHMAN MAHAMANDAL KASHMIR

GANESH ROAD, SRINAGAR.

NO DATED 19

तत् = तदा कथं प्रकाशताम्

तथापि = नूतन प्रकाशत्वेऽपि सति, स्मृतिरूपः प्रकाशः। स्मृतिप्रकाशः, अनुभवरूपः प्रकाशः परस्परम् निरपेक्षम् न स्यात्॥

तस्मात् स्वरूप – भेदेन प्रकारेण

एतत् = स्मृति संभवः

स्मृतौ स्वसंवेदनम् = स्वरूपभूतं संवेदनम्

स्वसंवेदनव्यतिरिक्तम् = स्वरूपभूतसंवेदनव्यतिरिक्तम्

तत्र = तस्यां स्मृतौ, क्रमते = प्रगल्भते

तावत्कालम् – स्मृत्यवधिं कालम् व्याप्नोति तावत्कालव्यापि, स्वसंवेदनम् – स्मृत्यनुभवयोः संवेदनम्

इत्यनया छायया = रचनया

पूर्व स्मृत्या – कारणभूतया.

स्वसंवेदनैकीभावेन भङ्ग्यन्तरेण = सारभूतस्वसंवेदनैकत्वेन रचनान्तरेण, स्मृत्या प्रमातृ सिद्धिरुक्ता।

अत्र संक्षेपः — स्मृतौ यैव स्वसंवित्तिः - सारभूतं स्वसंवेदनम् स्वात्मसंभवे स्मृत्याख्यविज्ञस्वरूपस्य प्रकाशने भरणे च प्रमाणं भवति, सैव स्वसंवित्तिः पूर्वानुभवस्य सद्भावे पूर्वानुभवस्य प्रकाशने भरणे च साधनम् प्रमाणम् आसीत्, अपरम् - अन्यत् प्रत्यक्षादिकं नासीत तस्य तत्र अशक्तत्वात्, तथा च स्वसंवेदनारूपैकप्रमातृसिद्धिरिति भावः

तत् = तदा कथं प्रकाशताम्

तथापि = नूतनप्रकाशत्वेऽपि सति, स्मृतिरूपः प्रकाशः। स्मृतिप्रकाशः - अनुभवरूपः प्रकाशः परस्परम् निरपेक्षम् न स्यात्॥

तस्मात् खम् - अनेन प्रकारेण

स्तात् = स्मृतिसंभवः

स्मृतौ स्वसंवेदनम् = स्वरूपभूतं संवेदनम्

स्वसंवेदनाव्यतिरिक्तम् = स्वरूपभूतसंवेदनव्यतिरिक्तम्

तत्र = तस्यां स्मृतौ, क्रमते = प्रगल्भते

तावन्तं कालम् — स्मृत्यवधिं कालम् व्याप्नोति तावत्कालव्यापि स्वसंवेदनम् - स्मृत्यनुभवयोः संवेदनम्

इत्यनया छायया = रचनया

पूर्वस्मृत्या — करणभूतया।

स्वसंवेदनैकीभावेन भङ्ग्यन्तरेण = सारभूतस्वसंवेदनैकत्वेन रचनान्तरेण, स्मृत्या प्रमातृसिद्धिरुक्ता।

Registered No. 116 Established 1915 phone No

(काश्मीरी ब्राह्मणों की एकमात्र प्रतिनिधि सभा)

ब्राह्मणमहामण्डल काश्मीर

BRAHMAN MAHAMANDAL KASHMIR

GANESH ROAD, SRINAGAR.

NO DATED 19

यत् कृतम् = अग्न्यादि पञ्चकस्य यः उपलंभः कृतः,
एकीकरिष्यते = प्रमाता इति शेषः
अत्र = अस्मिन् विषये, पूर्वमिति शेषः
अनुभूतातिरिक्ते = पूर्वानुभूतव्यतिरिक्ते
सापि = स्मृतिरपि
विज्ञानयोः :- स्मृतिकालीनानुभवकालीनयोः
ज्ञानयोः,
यः समन्वयः = योजनम् -
एकविषयीकरणम् इति यावत्, सः रूपं
यस्याः तादृशी.

अनुभूतः = पूर्वानुभूतः विषयः = घटादि
असौ स्मृतिः विषयस्य नूतनः प्रकाशो न भवति
यदि अस्य — विषयस्य, स प्रकाशः — स्मृतिरूपः
ग्राह्योऽनुभव एव भवति. प्रकाशः।

स चानुभवः — स्मृतिरूपतां गतः ग्राह्योऽनुभवः
ज्ञानरूपत्वेन ज्ञेयरूपत्वाभावात् ज्ञानान्तर-
संवेद्यो न भवति।
यदि तु स्वप्रकाशः — स्वेन स्वं प्रतिभासन-
शीलः भवति,
स च = अनुभवः
स्मृतिकाले यदि असन् भवति,

P.T.O.

अत्र संक्षेपः — स्मृतौ यैव स्वसंवित्तिः – सारभूतं स्वसंवेदनम् स्वात्मसंभवे स्मृत्याख्यनिजस्वरूपस्य प्रकाशने भरणे च प्रमाणं भवति, सैव स्वसंवित्तिः पूर्वानुभवस्य सद्भावे पूर्वानुभवस्य प्रकाशने भरणे च साधनम् प्रमाणम् आसीत्, अपरम्-अन्यत् प्रत्यक्षादिकं नासीत तस्य तत्र अशक्तत्वात्, तथा च स्वसंवेदनाख्यैकप्रमातृसिद्धिरिति भावः

तत् = तदा कथं प्रकाशताम्

तथापि = नूतनप्रकाशाभावेऽपि सति, स्मृतिरूपः प्रकाशः। स्मृतिप्रकाशः – अनुभवरूपः प्रकाशः परस्परम् निरपेक्षम् न स्यात्॥

तस्मात्, स्वम् – अनेन प्रकारेण

एतत् = स्मृति संभवः

स्मृतौ स्वसंवेदनम् = स्वरूपभूतं संवेदनम्

स्वसंवेदनव्यतिरिक्तम् = स्वरूपभूतसंवेदनव्यतिरिक्तम्

तत्र = तस्यां स्मृतौ, क्रमते = प्रगल्भते

तावत्कालम् — स्मृत्यवधिं कालम् व्याप्नोति
तावत्कालव्यापि स्वसंवेदनम् – स्मृत्यनुभवयोः संवेदनम्

इत्यनया छायया = रचनया
पूर्वस्मृत्या — कारणभूतया।
स्वसंवेदनैकीभावेन भङ्ग्यन्तरेण = सारभूतस्वसंवेदनैकत्वेन रचनान्तरेण, स्मृत्या प्रमातृसिद्धिरुक्ता।

तत्सद्व = स्मृत्यनुभवयोः संवेदनम् भावदायनी संवेदनेम् ॥

छायया = सूचनया

whether it be perception or inference, which can make remembrance possible. Therefore it is established that, that Self-Consciousness, which has continued existence, without any break, between the time of perception & that of remembrance, is the essence of the Subject. "What has been experienced by one cannot be remembered by another" was the argument which was advanced before in connection with remembrance to establish the existence of the Subject. But now the same has been done in a different manner i.e. by showing the identity of Self-Consciousness in both.

अनुभूतो विषयः = The object that has been already perceived

तत्र विषयस्य सा स्मृतिः = Here the object is simply remembered

स च प्राच्य एव अनुभवप्रकाशः = That which shines in remembrance is the former perception itself.

स च अनुभवो ज्ञानरूपत्वेन = That perception itself is of the nature of knowledge.

ज्ञेयरूपत्वाभावात् = and is not of the nature of an object

अपि तु स्वप्रकाशः = It is self-luminous.

यदेव स्मृतिस्वसंवेदनम् तदेव ...... स्वसंवेदनम् = Self conscious in remembrance is the same as that in perception.

न तु अपरं .... तत्र क्रमते = There is nothing else than Self consciousness whether it be perception or inference, which can make remembrance possible

अन्यत्र अनुभवतरि .... पूर्वमुक्ता = 'What has been experienced by one cannot be remembered by another' was the argument which was advanced before in connection with remembrance to establish the existence of the Subject.

स्वसंवेदनैकीभावेन = by showing the identity of self consciousness in both.

विकल्पाः = विकल्पादेवैकीकारसिद्धिरिति भावः ॥

∴ कार्यकारणभावादौ अनुभवमात्राद् प्रसिद्धेपि | ज्ञानानां विकल्पादेवैकीकारसिद्धिः

(1) → Other than that of direct perception.
(2) Spheres.

ननु अनुभवातिरिक्ते(1)ऽपि अर्थे(2) सन्तु विकल्पाः प्रमाणम्:

Let us admit the validity of determinate cognitions in the spheres, other than that of direct perception (अनुभवः) also.

कार्यकारणभावादौ। अर्थे—अनुभवमात्राद प्रसिद्धेऽपि।
तत् = अप्रामाण्यभाव,

अप्रामाण्यं हि बाधबलात् भवति .... कथं स्यात्?
For invalidity is due to contradiction. When there is no contradiction how can we talk of invalidity of any determinate cognition.

सत्यासत्य = सत्य और असत्य की जांच,
सोऽपि = बाह्य बाध्यबाधकभाव

सोऽपि .... दर्शयति: The author shows how this relation of contraries which is the very life of all worldly transactions inasmuch as it enables us to differentiate the real from the unreal is also not possible without the existence of one subject.

अनुभवातिरिक्तोऽपि = कार्यकारणभावादौ - अर्थे - अनुभवमात्राद प्रसिद्धेऽपि ॥

विकल्पाः = विकल्पादेवैकीकारसिद्धिरिति भावः

In this karika the teacher further says that the relation of contraries is also possible for the same reason i.e. depends upon the same self-consciousness (subject)

बाध्यबाधकभावोऽपि स्वात्मनिष्ठाविरोधिनाम्
ज्ञानानामुदियादेकप्रमातृपरिनिष्ठितेः ॥६॥

योजनाः- बाध्यबाधकभावोऽपि स्वात्मनिष्ठाविरोधिनाम् (भिन्नस्वाभासमात्रनिष्ठानां - ज्ञानानां - अन्योन्यं विरोधस्य अभावात्, तेषां) ज्ञानानाम् एक- प्रमातृ परिनिष्ठितेः (विश्रान्तौ) उदियात् (उदयति - उपपद्यते - युक्तम्)

ज्ञानानां बाध्यबाधकभावेऽपि एकप्रमातृपरिनिष्ठते — एकप्रमातृविश्रान्तिरेव हेतुरुदियात्। "स्वात्मनिष्ठाविरोधिनाम्" इति हेतुगर्भं विशेषणम्।

Eng: The relation of Contraries is possible only as a result of resting of all Cognitions, which resting in themselves separately cannot be annulers of one-another; in one (permanent) subject.

"बाधाभावे प्रामाण्यम्" = "Rightness of a thing depends upon, there being nothing to prove the contrary" (This is the maxim of Naiyāyikas)

इत्येतदर्थम् अवश्य समर्थ्यो यो बाधव्यवहारः = This The relation of contraries has to be proved

"सोऽपि" ---- शब्दस्यार्थः = But how that will that also be possible (if there be no permanent subject)? This is the significance of the word "अपि"

अवश्यसमर्थ्यः = अवश्यं साधनीयः

सोऽपि कथम् = एकप्रमातृपरिनिष्ठितिं विना कथम् स्यात्

इह तावत...... दृश्यते = "This Śukhti + not silver", in this statement it does not mean annulment of silver by 'Sukhti', for we did not see such a thing being done.

शुक्तिज्ञानेन .... इति नयुक्तम ...... विरोधस्य अभावात = Nor can it mean refutation of silver by "Sukhti" because two perceptions resting on their separate objects, or resting separately

in themselves, cannot refute ~~themselves~~ each other

अथाप्ययमेव विरोधः .... विघटेत सत्येतर प्रविभागः

Nor can it be said that their contrariness (Viradha) consists in mutual exclusion; for then all cognitions being such, it would be impossible to which annuls and which is annulled. and thus all distinction between right and wrong will be lost.

नजापि अत्रांत्रेण व्याख्येयः = Here the negative "a" (in "avirodhinam") has to be used in two different constructions.

एतदुक्तं भवति = What has been stated means as follows:-

यदि ज्ञानं स्वयं नश्यति तदा किं ज्ञानान्तरेण अस्य कृते =
If cognition (of silver) is itself destroyed what then has another cognition (knowledge of 'Shukti') done to it.

नहि तेन तत्कालेऽसंभवता तस्य विषयापहारः कर्तुं शक्यः = For the other cognition having no existence at the time of cognition of silver cannot possibly annul the object of latter.

न रजतम् इत्यपि ज्ञानं .... रजतज्ञानस्य =
Nor can the cognition "there is no silver" which refers to the absence of silver, annul

①

अथम् परस्पर परिहार एव — अन्योन्याभाव एव,
ज्ञानानां विरोधो भवति, नहि शुक्तिका-
ज्ञाने रजतज्ञानं भवतीति भावः

सर्वेषां ज्ञानानां विरोधात् = अन्योन्याभावाऽव्यभिचारेण
सिद्धात् विरोधात्,

स्वात्मनि परिनिष्ठा = नियतावस्थितिः

एव न लभ्या — लभ्या न भवति

"तन्त्रादि" इति — अत्र = अस्मिन् विषये, तन्त्रेण = दीपवत्
स्थिता युगपत् —
सर्वोपकारिरूपया तन्त्रवृत्त्या

अविरोधिनाम — न विरोधिनाम्.

संक्षेपः → योजना

ज्ञानानां बाध्यबाधकभावेऽपि एकप्रमातृपरिनिष्ठितेः —
एकप्रमातृविश्रान्तेरेव हेतोरुदियात् । कुत इत्यपेक्षायां
"स्वात्मनिष्ठाविरोधिनाम्" इति हेतुगर्भं विशेषणम्, यतः एतानि
ज्ञानानि स्वविषये स्वरूपमात्रे च विश्रान्तानि न तु अन्यविषये स्वरूपे
च व्यभिचरणशीलानि भवन्ति॥ न च अविरोधिनां परस्परं बाध्य-
बाधकभावो युक्तः, एकप्रमातृविश्रान्तत्वे तु तत्कृतस्य तस्य युक्तैव
इति ~~बा~~ बाध्यबाधकभावस्य स्वरूपलाभ इति भावः॥

ज्ञानम् = रजतज्ञानम्, नश्यति — एकक्षणावस्थायित्वात्
इति भावः

ज्ञानान्तरेण = "शुक्तिरियं" इति "न रजतम्"

तेन = ज्ञानान्तरेण, तत्काले = रजतज्ञानसमये P.T.O.

तत्रापि = तस्मिन्नपि पक्षे, किंचिदेव = रजतज्ञानमेव,
कथं स्यात् = न हि सर्वाणि ज्ञानानि युगपत् संभवन्ति इति
उत्तरज्ञानेन पूर्वं ज्ञानं बाध्यते एव इति सर्वज्ञानानां
बाध्यत्वं स्यात् न केवलं शुक्तिविषयस्य रजतज्ञान-
स्यैवेति भावः।

यदा तु स्वसंवेदने = स्वसंवित्तिरूपे प्रमातरि,
एतत् = ज्ञानानां बाध्यत्वे बाधकभावः॥ सा = विश्रान्तिः
संवेद्यते = अनुभूयते, ज्ञाने — विशेषणे विशेष्ये च विश्रा-
न्ते ज्ञानद्वयम्॥
विश्राम्यतः = विश्रामं भजतः,
परस्परानपेक्षण → परस्परानपेक्षया, नहि घटपटयोः
क्वापि परस्परमपेक्षा दृश्यते।
विश्राम्यत इत्यनेन — नैवात्रापि संबन्धः
कदाचिद्धि शुक्तिकायां रजतज्ञाने 'शुक्तिकेयम्'
इति बाधोत्पादः कदाचित्तु "न रजतम्" इति वा
तदीया = रजतसंबन्धिनी या परामर्शात्मक प्रमा-
तृरूपो यो व्यापारः तत्र च यदनुवर्तनम्
तस्य विध्वंसम् — विनाशम्, कुर्वीत → प्रत्युत तद्विरुद्ध
शुक्तिकाभाससंबन्धि विमर्शात्मक
प्रमातृरूपव्यापारानुवर्तनं कुर्वीत।
प्रतिष्ठाम् = प्रकाशरूप विश्रान्तिम्।
प्रमेयासंभवि → अचेतनेषु प्रमेयेषु असंभवोऽस्तम्।

Contd in (2)

(2)

तत् एव → निर्मितेहेतोरेव, अस्य = प्रमातुः

स्वतन्त्रदायि = स्वतन्त्रतोद्भावकम्

वाच्यित = अवप्रये वक्तव्ये

पूर्वज्ञानस्य → पूर्वं भातस्य शुक्तिकायां रजत-
ज्ञानस्य

परिवर्जनेन → प्रमातृस्वातन्त्र्यकृतेन उन्मूलनेन

विभिन्नता = विप्रचय विषयतां गता,

स्थितिः – शुक्तिका ज्ञानस्वरूपम्

मान व्यवहारानपि = भ्रम ज्ञानादिरूपान्

सत्त्व = सत्यं ज्ञानादि निर्मितृत्वेना भिमत एव।

तत् = ततः कारणात्, ते अपि = भ्रम ज्ञानादिरूपा
व्यवहारा आदि।

अयं भावः →

सत्यासत्यतया मते सर्वे भाव बुद्धे यदि
प्रकाशमानतया दृश्यते तदा सर्वम् अविरोधेन
परमार्थं सदैव, यदि तु भावतथा तदा सर्वम्
परमार्थमेवेति को भ्रमज्ञान प्रति असत्यत्व आ-
शंका॥

Registered No. 116 Established 1915 phone No

(काश्मीरी ब्राह्मणों की एकमात्र प्रतिनिधि सभा)

ब्राह्मणमहामण्डल काश्मीर

BRAHMAN MAHAMANDAL KASHMIR

GANESH ROAD, SRINAGAR.

NO. .... DATED 19

the the object of Cognition of Silver.
ज्ञाप्यपि ज्ञाते .... इयमेव सरणिः – कथं स्यात् – इति किंचिद्व बाध्यमिति = If it be said that one (succeeding) cognition destroys another (preceding), this being true of all cognitions, how can only some cognitions be said to be annulable?

यदा तु .... तथाहि = This is possible only if cognition of Silver as well as that of 'Sukti' rest on one self-consciousness. This point may be elaborated further as follows:–

एकत्रापि .... सा संवेद्यते = When these cognitions rest in one subject, all of them do not rest in the same way but differently; this is a fact of experience.

तथाहि .... विश्राम्यतः = For instance two cognitions "blue" & "lotus" resting in the subject, rest as mutually connected as adjective and substantive.

घट इति पट इति ..... अन्नात्मत्वेन = Similarly 'Jar' and 'cloth' (rest in the subject) as exclusive of each other.

शुक्तिका म इति न रजतम् .... प्रतिष्ठां भजते =

But in the case of "this is Sukhti" or "this is not silver", the consciousness "this is not silver" rests in the subject as destroying the previous consciousness "this is silver" and consequently stopping any action that follows the right knowledge.

एवं - - - - - - - - प्रमास्वतन्त्रतादाधि वाद्यम् = Thus the relative positions of cognitions to one another in the relation of cause & effect etc have been fixed by the subject, because of his freedom. This (fixing of relative position) is not possible for the objects of knowledge to do, (because they are insentient). This proves that प्रमातृ subject is free in the sphere of cognitions.

एवमेकत्र .... to end = Thus because the former cognition (of 'Silver') stands definitely annulled (by the cognition of Sukhti) in one subject, the relation of contraries, therefore, is possible in practical life: As the same Lord manifests these relations also through His freedom as He does other external objects, therefore, they are also real.

(*) (2) The purvapaksin says, just as the consciousness of the absence of jar on the ground is nothing but the consciousness of the voidness of the of the ground, so the knowledge of "Sokti" is nothing but the invalidity of the perception of "silver" — रूप्य ज्ञानाप्रमात्व वित् ॥

परकीयं मतम् = बौद्धमतम् बाध्यबाधकलक्षं

*शुद्धभूतल-ज्ञानम् एव घटाभाव-ज्ञानं ॥

विविक्तभूतलज्ञानं घटाभावमतिर्यथा ।
तथा चेच्छुक्तिकाज्ञानं रूप्यज्ञानाप्रमात्व
"रजत ज्ञानं वित् ॥७॥

योजना :- भूतलं शश्वद् विविक्तं (भवति); (यतः) भावानां स्वात्मनिष्ठितेः । तत्- ज्ञानं (भूतलज्ञानं) भिन्नस्य-अभाव-साधनम् जातु (कदाचिद् भवति, कदाचित् न भवति); तत् कथम् ?

Eng:- *(1) But if you say that just as the consciousness of the absence of jar on the ground is nothing else than consciousness of bareness of ground, so certainly about 'Shokti' is nothing but consciousness of invalidity of perception of Silver.

इह : ...."तत्परिच्छिन्न बुध्यते = The cognition "This is Sokti" being self luminous and being related to the subject as an object is experienced as identical with validity.

शुक्तिकाज्ञानम् = पूर्वं रजतज्ञानविषयीकृत शुक्तिका विषयं "शुक्तिकेयम" इति ज्ञानम्

स्वात्मानम् = शुक्तिकाज्ञानरूप निजं स्वरूपम्,

संविदत् = स्वप्रकाशत्वेन स्वसंवेदन विषयतां नयत्

स्वात्माभिन्नं = स्वरूपत्वेन स्थितम्, प्रमाणत्वम् = निजं प्रमाणभावम्

बुध्यते = स्वात्मवत् अनुभूयते । कुतः ?

"तत्परिच्छिनत्ति" इति न्यायात् = For Budha maxim is that definite cognition limits it self (cuts it self - off i.e. it is of well defined).

o अभिन्नः

तत्परिच्छेदनान्तरीयकश्च ...... तदेव उच्यते.

Now definite or determinate cognition of "this" is invariably concomitant with the differentiation from "not this".

तत्परिच्छेदनान्तरीयकश्च = तद्रूपस्वात्म परिच्छेदाव्यभिचारी च

अन्यव्यवच्छेदः = अतद्रूप रजत ज्ञान व्यवच्छेदः भवति, इति कारणात्

o — शुक्तिज्ञानापेक्षया - Thus representing the cognition of silver

ऽतद्रूपस्य → रजत-ज्ञानस्य - which is essentially nothing more than cognition of "Not Shokti" to be incorrect, means -

→ शुक्तिका ज्ञानाभिन्नं तत् प्रमाणत्व ज्ञानं भवति ॥

यत् एतत् शुक्तिका संवेदनाभिन्न प्रमाणत्ववेदनम्

which means the same thing as representing the cognition of "Shokti" to be identical with valid knowledge.

o → नवीनमुल्लिखितं वस्तु ॥

न च एतत् अपूर्वं .... इति प्रसिद्धमेतत्=

यत् = यतः कारणात्

It is not a new theory that the cognition of one thing means consciousness of absence of another. For, it is well known that

वस्त्वन्तरज्ञानमेव = घट-ज्ञानमेव

वस्त्वन्तराभावज्ञानम् = पटाभाव ज्ञानम् भवति ॥

Consciousness of bareness of the ground is the same as the consciousness of absence of jar on it,

एवम् -- ---- end.

Thus annulability of the cognition of silver is the realisation of its invalidity. Therefore if the opponent were to say that the relation of contraries can thus be accounted for and that accordingly oneness of the subject is un-necessary.

२३ = अत्र श्लोके, शुक्तिका ज्ञानम् = पूर्वं रजत ज्ञान विषयीकृत शुक्तिका विषयं "शुक्ति अयं" इति ज्ञानम् ॥

स्वात्मानम् = शुक्तिका ज्ञानरूपं निजं स्वरूपम्

संविदत् = स्वप्रकाशत्वेन स्वसंवेदन विषयतां नयत्। स्वात्माभिन्नम् = स्वरूपत्वेन

प्रमाणत्वम् - निजं प्रमाणभावम्, कथ्यते = स्वात्मवद् अनुभवे स्थापयत्।

तत्परिच्छेदनान्तरीयकश्च = तद्रूप स्वात्मपरिच्छेदाव्यभिचारी च,

अन्यव्यवच्छेदः = अतद्रूप रजत ज्ञान व्यवच्छेदः भवति ॥

प्राक्तन ज्ञानरूपस्य = शुक्ति ज्ञानापेक्षया ऽतद्रूपस्य

अप्रमाणत्ववेदनम् = अप्रमाणत्व ज्ञानम्, पण्डितैः

तदेवोच्यते यदेतत् ...... संवेदनम् = शुक्तिका ज्ञानाभिन्नं तत् प्रमाणत्व ज्ञानं भवति ॥

एतद् पूर्वम् = नवीन मुक्तिरहितं वस्तु

यत् = यतः कारणात्, वस्त्वन्तरज्ञानमेव वस्त्वन्तराभावज्ञानं भवति, अतद्व्यवच्छेदेनैव तद्व्यवस्था संभवात् ।

शुद्धभाग ग्रहणमेव = घट रहितस्य भाग ग्रहणमेव — घटाभाव ग्रहणं भवति न तु अभावाख्यस्य स्वतन्त्रस्य ग्रहणं घटाभावग्रहणं भवति ॥

*· The purvapaksin questions here, just as the consciousness of gar on the ground is nothing but the consciousness of the voidness of the ground, so the real knowledge of mother-of-pearl is nothing else than the consciousness of invalidity (fictitiousness) of the perception of silver (रूप्यज्ञानाप्रमात्ववित्) *₁

अत्र प्रसङ्गात् .... दूषयति,

In order to explain, by the way, the real basis, on which all transactions, connected with non-existence, are possible, he proves the relation, illustration, given in the system of the opponent, to be faulty.

*₁: The teacher explains refutes this :–

तस्य = भूतलस्य

*· नैव शुद्धस्थलज्ञानात्सिद्धेत्तस्याघटात्मता ।

नतूपलब्धियोग्यस्याप्यत्राभावो घटात्मनः

उपलब्धिलक्षणे प्राप्तस्यापि, घटात्मनः– ॥८॥

o = the that what is capable of being perceived.

व्यवहर्तव्य :: in practical life.

योजना :– घटस्वरूपस्य, अत्र भूतले शुद्धस्थलज्ञानात् अभाव: सिध्येत, उपलब्धि लक्षणं प्राप्तस्य पिशाचादेरभावसिद्धौ का कथा इत्यादि– शब्दाभिप्राय:, अन्ये हि वादिन: We say (teacher) that → उपलब्धि-योग्यस्य शुद्धभूतल ज्ञाने न *

अघटात्मता = absence of gar.

अत्र = शुद्धभूतले

Eng: → What has been stated is not right. For, from mere knowledge of the ground, its (ground's) being a separate entity from gar may be established, but certainly it cannot establish the absence or non-existence of gar (on the ground) which is capacable of being perceived.

→ *· अभावं साधयन्तीति अस्माकं तदपि नेष्टम् ॥

यो दृष्टान्त उक्तः .... कुत: ? The illustration that has been given is not to the point. The reasons are as follows:–

तादात्म्येन = सामानाधिकरण्येन

कदाचित् = भूतलस्वरूपव्यवस्थाकरणार्थं तादात्म्याभावग्रहे इत्यर्थः।

कदाचित् = भूतले घटाभावग्रहणकाले व्यतिरेकेण व्यवह्र अभावो व्यवह्रितव्य इति सम्बन्धः॥

शुद्धभूतलज्ञानात् = घटरहितभूतलज्ञानात्।

बोधः = तादात्म्याभावरूपः

व्यवहारः = अभावव्यवहारः॥

यत्र – आद्ये

दृश्यत्वम् = अभावप्रतियोगिनः अवश्यं द्रष्टुं योग्यत्वम्।

वा = पक्षान्तरे

तद्ग्राहकम् = शब्दग्राहकं यत् श्रोत्रादि-सामग्री साकल्यं तस्य

तत्र = तस्मिन् शुद्धभूतलग्रहणसमये

एकज्ञानेन = ~~एकज्ञानमेव प्रतियोगिग्राह-~~ केण तेनैव ज्ञानेन

संसर्गि = संसृज्यमानम्, तस्य विषयी भवदिति यावत्

P.T.O

यद् वस्त्वन्तरम् = अन्तर प्रागस्पन्दादि
जनित शब्दादिरूपं किमपि
वस्तु, तस्य या प्रतिपत्तिः
तस्याः अभावात् हेतोः
असिद्धत्वात् हेतोः,
यस्य शब्दादेरूपलब्धिलक्षणप्राप्ति
न अस्ति, तस्मिन समये ग्रहण-
उपाय अभावात् यस्य वस्तुनः
उपलम्भयोग्यत्वं न अस्ति इति
यावत्
तस्यापि = स्वभावविप्रकृष्टस्य
पिशाचादेः प्राक् कारण सामग्री
विप्रकृष्टस्य शब्दादेश्च

इह .... "इह भूतले घटो न" इति =

We talk of two types of non-existence in our practical life. The one is तादात्म्याभावः i.e. non-existence of a thing as identical with that wherein it is said to be non-existing e.g. "the ground (भूतल) is not jar". The other is व्यतिरेकाभावः i.e. non-existence which denies separate possible existence of a thing at a particular time & place. "Here on this ground there is no jar."

प्रायो तत्र = तादात्म्येन अभावव्यवहारे "इह भूतलं न घटः"

यत्र = In the first case.

नास्ति = तदात्म्याभावे दृष्टत्वेन उपयोगि।

स्वभाववलात् = स्वभावतः पिशाचो न उपलभ्यते एव।

उपलब्धिः — लक्षण प्राप्तिरपि हि यस्य नास्ति पिशाचादिः

तत्र .... — स्वभाववलात् = In the case of first of these, transaction is based simply on the knowledge of the bare ground. In this case, the optical perception is of no use. (i.e. is not responsible for the idea of non-existence). Therefore, the implication is that there is the non-existence of the relation of identity even with that, the direct perception of which is not possible, for existence that of Pichacha, because of his peculiar nature; ~~a that of Sound is not perceptible, of the entire Set of Causes,~~

यस्य वा शब्दादेः .... भूतले न पिशाचो न शब्द इति, =

or that of Sound is not Perceptible, of which is not perceptible, because of the

साकल्यस्य = ऐसे पक्ष को जिसके श्रोत्र विषय परिपूरण हूँ

*· एक प्रकार मेव तत्र ह्योरादि स्वभाव विप्रकर्षी भावविप्रकर्षी भावात् । प्रकर्षी भावात् अन्यथा पलम्भात् क्षोमात् । इति स्फुटमेव स्थूलस्थलस्य ज्ञानात् — केवल स्थल ज्ञानात् तस्य स्थलस्य घटोल्लासिद्धिः — समस्त-घटादि पदार्थ भावना सिद्धिरिति ॥

absence of entire set of Causes, a fact which is known definitely because of the non-perception of anything that can be object of hearing (eg. the Sound which which which is audible when we close our ears and which would have been audible perceptible if the set of Causes had been present). Thus when a person says "the ground is not jar" he means it is neither anything else such as Sound or pishacha. But when direct perception is admittedly responsible for the idea of non-existence, as in the case of भिन्न व्यतिरेकाभावा, here such is not the case. *

यो दृष्टान्तः = समानाधिकरण्येनाभावो घटते "भूतले न घट" इति

इति चेत → भूतले घटो न भवति

इह = अब अभाव तत्त्व स्पष्ट करता है ॥

(1) यहि से अब तादात्म्य भाव से अभाव तत्त्व की सिद्धि दिखलाता है ·

न एषोऽभ्युपाय := तथात्वे हि पिशाचस्यापि व्यतिरेकेणाभावः सिद्धेरिति नोक्त न्यायेनाभाव सिद्धिः ॥

*· अयं भावः = पुरुषः वस्तु गृह्णन् तदितर सर्व भाव व्यतिक्तमेव गृह्णाति, अन्यथा सरू की गीतापत्तिः, तदितर सर्व व्यतिरेकेण ग्रहणमेव च फलतः सर्वं तदितर सर्वाभाव ग्रहणम्। तदितर सर्वं च द्विविधम्, उपलब्धु योग्यमयोग्यञ्चेति, तत्र किंचित् स्वभाव-विप्रकृष्टम्, यथा पिशाचादि परमाण्वादि च, किंचित् तु ग्रहणोपाय विप्रकृष्टम्, यथा ग्राहकसामग्र्या विषयतां न याति इति उपलब्धुमयोग्यमपि द्विविधम् । उपलब्धुं योग्यं तु *

* · But if any body were to ask: why? Reply is because in that case its scope would become too wide. This is what he shows in the following lines:—

कुतः? इति चेत — अति प्रसङ्गात् इति ब्रूमः, तमेव दर्शयां
(scope is too wide)

*

विविक्तं भूतलं शश्वद्भावाना स्वात्मनिष्ठितेः।
तत्कथं जातु तज्ज्ञानं भिन्नस्याभाव साधनम्॥९

योजना: भूतलं शश्वद् विविक्तं (भवति); (यतः) भावानां स्वात्मनिष्ठेः तत्- ज्ञानं (भूतलज्ञाने) भिन्नस्य- अभाव- साधनम् जातु - (कदाचित् भवति, कदाचित् न भवति); तत कथम्॥

Eng: "The ground is always separate from, (भूतलं शश्वद् विविक्तं) (i.e. not identical with) other things, because all objects have their (यतः भावानाम् स्वात्मनिष्ठितेः) separate and self confined existence. How then is it that knowledge (तज्ज्ञानं) of the ground is the cause of consciousness of absence or non-existence of other things at one time (कदाचित्) & not at (किसी समय) another?" (भिन्नस्याभावसाधनम्).

विद्यमानेऽपि .... to end:—

Even when there is a jar (on the ground) the purity of the ground is not marred, because different objects do not get mixed up together (i.e. have separate existence). How then is it that even at the time when there is a jar (on the gro. we do not say as we would do if there is were really no jar e.g. "there is no jar here on the ground"? "Its knowledge" (तज्ज्ञानम्) i.e. knowledge of bare ground "sometimes" (Jatu) is only under certain conditions, but

as that of actual absence of gar, and not always, establishes non-existence of a separate gar. How is that possible? Thus व्यतिरेकाभावः (according to the opponents' theory) should imply the absence of even pisacha.

It is under s. certain special circumstances only, not always, that the knowledge of bare ground will indicate the absence of any particular object say a pot (घटः) only & nothing else. But we know from the common experience of everyday life that the existence of one thing means the non-existence of another (इह भाव एव भावान्तरस्य अभाव इति व्यवहर्तव्यः, इति अयं तावत् अपरित्याज्यः प्रातीतिकः (अनुभवसिद्धः) पन्थाः ॥). This however, would not mean that the knowledge of non-existence of anything on the bare ground indicates the idea of the absence of of a particular object, say घटः only, and not any other thing. This reasoning leads to the fact that it is the sentient subject who infers about the absence of a particular object (घटः) only, the idea of which comes into his consciousness in some particular circumstances, and not the idea of any other thing say a पिशाचः, which is not in his consciousness in those circumstances. So the teacher says :*- →

↙

next page Top: *

अपरिदृष्टम् → चिरन्तनैर्हि शुद्धभूतलदृष्टेरेवाभावसाधकत्वमुक्तम् न चैतद्युक्तम्.

व्यवहारा: = भूतल ... ; अथ आविर्भूतः = अद्भुततः; स्फुट

कस्यांचिदेव दशायाम् = घटादिसन्निधिरूपायाम् , गतिः = उपायः

नन्वेवं व्यतिरेकाभावनिष्ठो .... दर्शयति ॥

प्रतीत: = is talked of — But how is that then we consistently talk of व्यतिरेकाभाव in practical life only under

कस्यांचित् = of under certain conditions. — certain conditions? How is this to be explained? With this objection in mind the author shows the way of accounting for it, which

तत्र का गतिः? — was unknown to his predecessors.

चिरन्तनैर = predecessors → Read note 141 below also.

किं त्वालोकचयोऽन्धस्य स्पर्शो वोष्णादिको मृदुः ।

अपरिदृष्ट = which was unknown.

तत्रास्ति साधयेत्तस्य स्वज्ञानमघटात्मताम् ॥ १०॥

is perceptible on the ground. — that would establish — non-identity of his cognition with that of jar.

योजना :—

किंतु (सामान्य-मातुः) तत्र आलोचय: (अस्ति); अन्धस्य (तत्र) उष्णादिकः मृदुः स्पर्शः (अस्ति); (तेन प्रकारेण) तस्य (भूतलस्य) अघटात्मताम् (अघट-रूपता) स्वज्ञाने (स्वेन रूपेण ज्ञाने) साधयेत (साधयति) ॥

Eng: " But the mass of light (in the case of one who can see) or touch, warmth, or soft, in the case of blind man, is perceptible on the ground. That would establish non-identity of his cognition with that of jar."

(that establishes his cognition of the absence of a jar)

तत्रास्ति = भूतले , तस्य = आलोकादेः note 144 below (read).

(तस्याघटात्मताम् स्वज्ञानम् साधयेत्)

भाव: = शिलादे: , भावान्तरस्य = घटस्य, प्रातीतिक: पन्था: = अनुभव-
तत्र = तस्मिन् पथि सिद्ध: This is what we know from the experience of everyday life.

इति वाक्यार्थ: =

इह भाव एव ....

आधाराधारभावे: = कुण्डबदरयो

According to this system, the existence of one thing means non-existence of another. This is what we know from the experience of ordinary every day life. This way of knowing the non-existence, (as pointed out by experience) has not to be left. [1]The relation of existence (of one thing) with non-existence (of another) is the same as that of two things, which stand in relation of container and contained. Therefore whatever different from jar is seen on the ground, it may be a piece of stone, or mass of light etc, which is perceived by means of eyes, [2]is in ordinary life spoken of as "not being of jar on the ground" or "there is no jar on the ground". And whenever there is no optical perception, as when the eyes are closed or there is very thick darkness, then also the subject, who experiences touch, which is different from hard which belongs to jar, such as soft, hot, or cold or neither, speaks of that (touch) in practical life as non-existence of jar, [3]because touch of air must necessarily be everywhere. This is the substance of the verse. The word meaning is as follows :-.

[1] = तत्र भावस्य भावान्तरेण च आधाराधार- भाव: सहव भावाभावयो: ; ततश्च = therefore

घटव्यतिरिक्तं = वस्त्वन्तरं = whatever is different from jar.

[2] = भूतले घटाभावो ...... इति वा"

[3] = वायुस्पर्शस्य सर्वगतस्य भावात्"

'किं तु' .... परामर्शः = The word 'but' (किंतु) emphés pichúng up of the objection in order to state one's own view.

किं पुनरत्र ..... तत्राह = what is the correct view in this case? The reply is :-

तत्र भूतले 'आलोकचयः" .... इति लिङ् =

"There" (तत्र)" ie on the ground "the mass of light" is undoubtedly the object of cognition. To the blind there is hot touch etc "of that" (तस्य) ie of the mass of light or of touch; 'its own knowledge' (स्वज्ञानम्) ie the knowledge that refers to it as distinct from another, such as gar etc; that स्वज्ञानम् which is the subject; 'of that' (तस्य) ie of the light etc; "identity with not-gar" (अघटरूपताम्) ie identity with not-being of jar;

तत्कर्तृ = which is the subject "of that"

"there" (तत्र) ie on the ground: establishes. The implication of Lin Lakāra is that it is possible. Here Lin is in accordance with the rule: "Lin" is also used to imply possibility".

आन्तर प्राणस्पन्दनजनित .... to end.

आन्तर.......
संभावयमान:

A person who is aware of the possible existence of the entire set of things, necessary for hearing, such as his sense of hearing etc, because he hears the feeble sound, caused by the vital working of the vital air within, and he hears that sound only as related to his own auditory cognition denies another sound as "there is no other sound here". Similarly if his attention be fixed on the most subtle interior sound, he experiences not-being of the feeble sound (of vital air). And not-being of flavour, smell and touch also is experienced by him only who experiences the flavour of Sol Saliva, the smell of the ~~of the~~ interior of organ of smell called "Triputika" or the touch of body.* For, without the perception of one out of many things, which can be the objects of the same kind of perception, there can be no certainty about the means of perception being intact. This is unexceptionable. It is not right to hold that the contact with a thing, which is an object of the same kind of perception

*. नहि एकज्ञानसंसर्ग-
योग्यवस्त्वन्तरोपलम्भं
विना .... अस्ति.

इति एकान्तहृदः॥

आन्तर इति → बहिःशब्दाभावेऽपि हि पिहितकर्णः
प्राणजनितमान्तरं सततम् ईवरन्तमनाहतारव्यं
शब्दं शृणोतीत्येवमुक्तम्.

एक ज्ञानेन = समस्त शब्द ग्रहणयोग्येन श्रोत्रकृतेन
ज्ञानेन,

संसर्गिणम् : संस्पृश्यमानम् ।

तत् इति – तस्य सूक्ष्मतमस्य शब्दस्याभावः तम्,
सूक्ष्मतमः यः अन्तर्नादः तत्रावहित श्रोत्रे
यस्य सः,

वेदयते = अनुभूयते (आन्तरशब्दानां दशधा
भिन्नत्वात्)

[समाधौ लीनस्य समस्तान्तर शब्दाभाव बोधः सतत
उच्चारदपरिमिताद्धु परामर्शीवधान कृतो ज्ञेयः,
तदभावस्त्व संभवोपहत एवेत्यलम्]

संवेदयमानेन = अनुभवता, अत एव रसेन्द्रियावैकल्ये
संभावयमानेन,

रसाभावः = आस्वादाभावः, वेद्यः भवति.

कायोयम् → काय संनिधानम्

एकान्तः = निश्चयः भवति

एकज्ञानसंसर्गीयोग्यानां मध्ये यद्वस्त्वन्तरं
तस्य उपलंभेन विना उपलब्धिकारणसाकल्य
-स्य निश्चयः नास्ति॥

अयमत्राभिप्रायः →

पुरुषस्य वा तदभाव ग्रहणे निजेन्द्रियसाकल्यता
-पि निर्णेया, अन्यथा इन्द्रियवैकल्य दोषकृत
तद्वस्तु ग्रहणाभावेन तदभावे यत्न उपहास-
सविषयतामेव भजते, तत् निजेन्द्रिय साकल्य
-ज्ञानञ्च न समस्त तद् ग्रहणापेक्षं
किंतु तद्ग्राह्यमध्ये यथेकमेव कंचिदर्थं P.T.O.

गृह्णाति तेनैव तत्साकल्यं जानाति मनेन्द्रियं

पुरस्तेनैव वर्तत इति। ततश्च अगृहीतानामन्ये-

षामभावं निश्चिनोति, ते इह न सन्तीति।

तत्र तदिन्द्रियकार्यं सर्वग्राह्यज्ञानम् एकज्ञानम्,

तद्विषयभूतं यदेकं वस्तु - संसर्गयोग्यवस्त्वन्तरम्

तस्य यज्ज्ञानं तेन ग्राहकसामग्री साकल्यज्ञानम्॥

अचिरप्रवृत्तः = समनन्तरसंपन्नः यः तत् तत् विषय

अनुभवः तेन कल्पितस्य — अस्तित्वेन

कल्प्यमानस्य

करणस्य = ग्राहकसाकल्यरूपस्य प्रमाणस्य

तदैव = समनन्तरमेव, ~~क्रियमाण~~ क्रियमाणवस्तु-

ग्रहणसमय एव।

ध्वंसनाशङ्कनात् = नाश शङ्काकरणायोगात्.

~~करण~~ कारणसाकल्यनिश्चयः

भवति।

(as the one, not-being of which is to be asserted), is unnecessary for certainty about the means of perception being intact; because we cannot say that the means of knowledge is not intact ~~through the recent experiences~~ just after the time when we have realised it to be intact through the recent experiences of various objects. For, the person who desires to find out not-being a particular object, is found using the sense-organs through which it can be perceived.

अचिरप्रवृत्तितत्तद्विषय .... किम् एकज्ञानसंसर्गितया =

It is not right to hold that the contact with a thing which is an object of the same kind of perception .... just after the time when we have realised it to be intact through the recent experience of various objects.

ननु एवम् :- - - - - - - - - - - - - तद्वत् पिशाचादेरपि ?

But from this view it will follow that we can talk of non-existence of even the imperceptible pishacha, as व्यतिरेकाभाव:, because just as the mass of light is different from jar, so it is from pishacha. With this objection in mind the author says the following

*. though different from light. पिशाचः स्यादनालोकोऽप्यालोकाभ्यन्तरे यथा।
Because he is imperceptible ← अदृश्यो, भूतलस्यान्त र्न निषेध्यः स सर्वथा ॥१२॥

योजना:-

यथा अनालोकः पिशाचः (अदृश्यः) स्याद्, (स एव पिशाचः) आलोकाभ्यन्तरे (दृश्यः) अपि (स्यात्); अदृश्यः (सन्) भूतलस्य अन्तः सर्वथा स निषेध्यः न (भवति).

Eng: Just as pishāchā, though different from light, yet can be within light itself, because he is imperceptible, so his existence within the ground cannot totally be denied."

आलोकपुञ्जो . . . . to end =

Although mass of light is different from pishācha, yet it cannot be said there is no pishacha here. For, the jar cannot

So the perception of mother-of-pearl, means not-being of cognition of silver. This is the possibility.' Just as perception of jar is the consciousness of validity of the knowledge of jar, so not-being of the perception of cloth is the consciousness of the validity of the same. All this is a representation of various aspects of a perceptions of jar. This does not affect another former perception in any way.

Similarly the consciousness "This is mother-of-pearl or it is not silver" may shine in itself as "I am valid in relation to 'mother-of-pearl' and not-being of silver but not in relation to silver". But this does not affect former perception of silver in any way. How can silver, grasped by a former perception be proved to be false?

न किञ्चिद्वाधायातम् = न कापि बाधा संपन्ना।

इयत् = इ एतावन्मात्रम्

पूर्व प्रवृत्तम् – घटविषये पूर्वं प्रवृत्तम्,

ज्ञानान्तरस्य – तत्रैव क्रमेण प्रवृत्तस्य पटोऽयमिति ज्ञानस्य,

किमपि – कापि बाधेत्यर्थः।

'अहम्' इति → एतत् च स्वात्मना प्रकाशनं प्रमातृद्वारेणैवास्य सिद्ध्यति, नहि ज्ञानं नाम प्रमातुभिन्नं यदहमिति परामर्शं कुर्यादिति न कोऽपि विरोधः॥

तावता तु – प्रकाशमात्रेण, किञ्चित् = कापि बाधा,

न वृत्तम् = न संपन्नम्, तद्विषयीकृतम् = अबाधितरजतविषयं कृतम्।

एवं प्रसङ्गात् .... योजयति ,

Thus having shown by the way the real nature of the idea of not-being in practical life, the author makes use of it in the present context, as follows :-.

एवं रुप्यधियाभावरुपा शुक्तिमतिर्भवेत्
नत्वाद्यरजतज्ञप्तेः स्यादप्रमाण्यवेदिका
॥१२॥

योजना :- शुक्तिमतिः (शुक्तिज्ञानम्) रुप्यधियाभावरुपा (रजतज्ञानाभावरुपा) (सिद्ध्यति); सा (शुक्तिमतिः) तु आद्यरजतज्ञप्तेः (तदानीन्तनरजतज्ञानस्य) अप्रमाणवेदिका (अप्रमाण्यज्ञापिका) न (भवति).

Eng: " Thus the ascertainment " this is the mother-of-pearl" may mean not being (of the cognition) of silver. But it cannot prove the knowledge of silver, got on a former occasion, to be false."

यथा आलोको .... to end.

Just as though the consciousness of light means the consciousness of not being of jar, yet perception of light does not affect the former perception of jar in anyway,

स्वसंवेदनात् = विविक्त भूतल प्रत्यक्षात् । असिद्ध्यति बाधा = न ज्ञातामात्
यावत् ...... न सिद्ध्यति = सति धर्मिणि धर्मा = सिद्ध्यन्ति ॥

नेयः = योजनीयः न केवले .... हेतोः व्याप्तेश्च,

इह....हेतुना = सति धर्मिणि धर्मचिन्ता इति न्यायात् ॥ The relation of Contraries cannot be explained either in terms of direct perception or in those of inference, because the minor term in itself is absent. Here the word 'अपि' implies non-existence of reason & and invariable Concomitance

अप्रमाण्यं साध्यधर्मः = इदं रूप्यज्ञानम् अप्रमाणम् शुक्तिका इति ज्ञानात् ।

अपिः उभयत्र नेयः = The word "अपि" is to be connected with both (धर्म्यसिद्धेरपि) and अनुमानतः. When both

विषयगते = शुक्तिगते

अ इह धर्मिणि .... अनुमानव्यापारः = When both the minor term (Dharmin) and the reason are beyond all doubts and the invariable Concomitance of reason with what is tried to be established is remembered, the inference operates to prove that what is tried to be established is really present in minor term.

तत्काले = शुक्तिज्ञानकाले

इह च प्राच्ये रूप्यज्ञाने .... इत्यपि असत् ॥

In the case of the in hand, the former cognition of silver being the minor term, the point to be established is its invalidity, and perception of mother-of-pearl or consciousness "It is not silver" or the objectivity to that perception, which belongs to the object, is represented to be the reason. This is not right, because at the time of perception of mother-of-pearl the former cognition of silver has no existence (because cognitions are momentary). Nor is the perception of mother-of-pearl a

साध्यासिद्धिः = यथापूर्वं तस्य वेदितमत्वे

अतः = अपक्षधर्मात्

स्मर्यमाणे = व्याप्त्यां

असत् = अपक्षधर्मत्वात् ।

① At the time of cognition of Sukhti, the minor term (dharmi) i.e. the previous cognition of silver is non existent (dharmyasiddhe api) the relation of contraries cannot be maintained even by inference.

ननु इदमित्यनेन .... इत्याशङ्क्याह =

तेदेव = शुक्ति खण्ड

See Note 171 on Post.

But the word "this" refers to the same object as that which was the basis of valid knowledge ~~of S. Knowledge~~ of silver ~~~~ now is that of "mother-of-pearl ~~&~~ not silver". Therefore from this we infer that the former perception of "Silver" was invalid. For it is not possible, that two valid though contrary, cognitions may refer to the same object. Therefore this relation of contraries in practical life is due to inference. With this objection in his mind, the Author says:—

① neither on direct perception

The relation of contraries cannot be maintained on inference

Dharmi = the minor term (dharmi) i.e. the previous cognition of silver is non-existent

धर्म्यसिद्धेरपि भवेत बाधा नैवानुमानतः
स्वसंवेदनसिद्धा तु युक्ता सैकप्रमातृजा ॥१३॥

Because it is proved to be so by personal experience.

योजनाः — (यतः शुक्तिकाज्ञानकाले) धर्मि (णः) (पूर्वरजतज्ञानस्य) असिद्धेः; (तस्मात्) अनुमानतः अपि बाधा (बाध्यबाधकभावः) नैव भवेत; स (बाध्यबाधकभावः) तु एक प्रमातृजा (एकप्रमातृमयसंवेदने) युक्ता (सङ्घटते); (यतः तत्) स्वसंवेदनसिद्धा (भवति) ॥

Eng: "The relations of contraries cannot be maintained to be based either on perception or on inference; for the minor term is non-existent. But it can be rightly maintained to be due to one subject, because, it is proved to be so by personal experience". (The teacher means to say that neither one particular cognition is potent to contradict the other; nor is there the possibility of inference ①

① to annul the false cognition of Silver owing to the absence of the minor term (dharmi) i.e. the previous inference

प्रवृत्तिके · (1)

यत्र = परमार्थतः स्थितायां यस्यां शुक्तौ,
तत्रैव = तस्यां शुक्तावेव,
प्रमाणमूलम् = प्रमाणतया स्थितम्,
जातम् = सम्पन्नम्. ततः = ततः कारणात्
अतः = अस्मात् हेतोः,
निरस्तविषयद्वयावगाहि = अन्योन्यव्यावृत्तस्वरूप-शुक्तिकारजताख्यविषय-विषयम्,
एकत्र = एकस्यां शुक्तौ
आनुमानिकः = अनुमानसिद्धः

———

स्वसंवेदनात् = प्रत्यक्षानुभवात्।
हेतोः व्याप्तेश्च → असिद्धेरिति शेषः = both are being absent — the minor term cannot be established
उभयत्र ज्ञेयः → धर्म्यसिद्धेरपि अनुमानतोऽपीति द्विधा योजनीय इत्यर्थः।
इह → साध्यधर्मस्य = that what is to be established च: प्रयोगः → असंबन्धः;
तस्य व्यवच्छेदः, साध्यधर्मेण तद्वत्त्वमिति यावत्
अनुमानव्यापारः → लक्षणया अनुमानव्यापारेण
रजतज्ञाने — तत्र → तस्मिन् साध्यधर्मे। ताभ्यां ज्ञानाभ्यां विषयीकार्यत्वे
विषयगतम् = शुक्तिगतम्।
हेतूक्रियेत → इति संभावनायां लिङ्,
ननु, त्रयमध्ये किञ्चिद् हेतुं करिष्याम =
आह "न चैतत" — P.T.O

तत्काले = शुक्तिज्ञानकाले न रजतमिति ज्ञानकाले वा
आद्यस्य, पश्चाद्बोधस्य च ग्रहणम् ननु ते तस्य धर्मा
मा सन्तु ततः किमित्यत आह "न च" इति

अपक्षधर्मात् = पक्षावृत्तेर्हेतोरित्यर्थः -

स्मर्यमाणम् — स्मृतिविषयीक्रियमाणम्

तत् = आद्यरजतज्ञानम् । "असत" → धर्मिसिद्धावपि
हेतोरपक्षधर्मत्वादिति भावः

प्रकारान्तरेणानुमानं शङ्कते "अथ" इति.

इति = एवम् साध्यते - तथा च धर्मिणः न सिद्धिः,
नापि हेतोरपक्षधर्मत्वमिति भावः ॥

तत् = शुक्तेः रजतज्ञानाविषयत्वसाधनम्,
यदि इदानीम् - क्रियते इति शेषः
तदा सिद्धसाधनम् भवति प्रत्यक्षसिद्धत्वात्.

अथ = यदि, पूर्वम् — तदानीमपि शुक्तिः न
रजतज्ञानस्य विषयः इति तच्छुक्तेः
रजतज्ञानविषयत्वसाधनं क्रियते ॥
तदा स्वसंवेदनेन करणेन बाध्यो विषयः
साध्यं यस्य हेतोः स बाध्यविषयः, तस्य
भावस्तत्ता, बाध्यविषयत्वमिति यावत्, भवति,
अत्र हि स्वसंवेदनमेव साक्षि, पूर्वं शुक्तिः
रजतज्ञानस्य विषय आसीदिति । तथा च
यथा "अग्निरनुष्णो द्रव्यत्वात्" इत्यत्र
बाधितविषयत्वं तथात्रापि भावः ॥

अत्र दोषान्तरमाह "केन च" इति
बौद्धमते नित्यस्य प्रमातुरसंभवात् —

अनवस्था — तस्य अनुमानस्यापि अन्यापेक्षा ॥

तयोः ज्ञानयोः = "रजतमिदम्" "शुक्तिकेयम्"

जानीयात् = भवन्मते एकस्य नित्यस्य प्रमातुरसंभवात्
न कोऽपि जानीयादिति भावः।

ननु कुतो न जानीयादित्यत आह "ते हि" इति

ते = ज्ञाने इति = अतः कारणात्

अन्येनानताऽपि बाधा न भवति।

अत्र प्रतीता = अस्मिन् बाधाप्रतीतिव्यवहारे

तथाभूतं व्यवधानम् = अनुमानयोग्यहेतुग्रहण
व्याप्तिस्मरणादिरूपव्यवधानम्

न संवेद्यते = न अनुभूयते

स्वसंवेदनसिद्धतया → स्वसंवेदनरूपप्रत्यक्ष-
सिद्धतया।

झटिति → हेतुग्रहणव्याप्तिस्मरणादिकं
विना

स एव = प्रमातैव , तथानिर्णीता → बाधकतां
भवति

अन्यथानुपपत्तिः = बाध्यबाधकभावं विना
अयोग्यता,

अध्रुवा = एकप्रमात्रङ्गीकारे

सर्वेन = सर्वैः स्मृतिसंबन्धानिवहैः

NB
The teacher means to say that neither one particular cognition is potent itself to contradict the other, nor is there the possibility of inference to annul the false cognition of silver, owing to the absence of the minor term (Dharmi) in the process of inference.

स्वसंवेदनात् = विविक्त भूतल प्रत्यक्षात्:   निद्‌दूयात बाधा = न रजतामात

यावत् ...... न सिद्ध्यति = सति धर्मिणि धर्मा: सिद्ध्यन्ति ॥

नेयः = योजनीयः न केवले .... हेतो: व्याप्तेश्च,

इह.... हेतुना = सति धर्मिणि धर्मचिन्ता इति न्यायात् ॥ The relation of contraries cannot be explained either in terms of direct perception or in those of inference, because the minor term in itself is absent. Here is the word 'अपि' implies non-existence of reason & and invariable concomitance

अप्रमाण्यं साध्या धर्मः = इदं रूप्यज्ञानम् प्रमाण शुक्तिका इति ज्ञानात्,

अपि: उभयत्र नेयः = The word "अपि" is to be connected with both (धर्म्यसिद्धेरस्ति) and अनुमानतः. When both

विषयगते = शुक्तिगते

स इह धर्मिणि .... अनुमानव्यापारः = When both the minor term (Dharmin) and the reason are beyond all doubts and the invariable concomitance of reason with what is tried to be established is remembered, the inference operates to prove that what is tried to be established is really present in minor term.

तत्काले = शुक्ति-ज्ञानकाले

साध्यासिद्धिः = यथा पर्वतस्य वह्निमत्वे

अतः = अपक्षधर्मात्

समयि नाशे = व्याप्त्या

असत् = अपक्षधर्मत्वात्,

इह च प्राच्ये रूप्यज्ञाने .... इत्यपि असत् ॥

In the case of the in hand, the former cognition of silver being the minor term, the point to be established is its invalidity, and perception of mother-of-pearl or consciousness "It is not silver" or the objectivity to that perception, which belongs to the object, is represented to be the reason. This is not right, because at the time of perception of mother-of-pearl the former cognition of silver has no existence (because cognitions are momentary). Nor is the perception of mother-of-pearl a

characteristic feature of cognition of silver
(as Smoke is of fire) and ⊕ inferential know-
ledge is not possible from that which is
not the special characteristic of the minor
term. Therefore, this is not right to represent
the remembered cognition of silver to be the
minor term.

⊕ न च प्रत्यक्षमीत साध्यसिद्धिः ---

अथ शुक्तिः न रजतज्ञानस्य ------------ इति चेत अनव-
स्था:.

* अथ ---- शुक्तिका-ज्ञानविषयत्वात् इति

* But if some one were to say "we are trying to establish that mother-of pearl is not the object of cognition of silver, because it is the object of perception of mother-of-pearl". I shall ask him

तत यदि इदानीम् तत्सिद्धसाधनम्

"Are you drawing this inference at the time of perception of 'mother-of-pearl'? If so, it is nothing more than establishing the already established. * But if before the perception of 'mother-of-pearl' ⊕ then the inference would be defective inasmuch as its reason would be futile (Bhā Bādhita hetvābhāsa); because the reverse of what is seeks to prove is already established by cognition of silver which has just taken place.

* अथ पूर्वम्

⊕ तदा तत्पूर्वस्य संवेदनेन

न च तया। नूनम् -...... - अनुमानस्यापि हेतुसंग्रहणाद्यात्
स्मरणादिरूप व्यवधानम् न अनुभूयते।
स्वसंवेदनरूप प्रत्यक्षत्वात्
सिद्धतया हेतुग्रहणाद्यपि स्मृत्यादिकं विना ॥

Moreover (in the absence of permanent Subject,
*Who would acquire the idea of invariable
Concomitance viz where there is one cognition
at present there another Cognition cannot be:
If the opponent were to say by another
inference, then I would repeat the same
question and this would lead to Argumentum-
ad-infinitum.

केन

एतेन एतत् प्रत्युक्तम् .... बाधा नाम सम्भूत:

The above discussion refutes the objection
of the opponent, "How could two Cognitions be
possible in reference to one object?" For,
who would have the Consciousness of two
Cognitions having the same object, because it
has been asserted that Cognitions rest in
themselves & in their objects? Thus the relation
of Contraries cannot be asserted to be
based on inference also. *Nor is the infer-
ential process experienced to intervene in
the rise of the Consciousness of the relation of
Contraries. For, as our own experience tells us
it rises quickly. Therefore, for the same rea-
son, the relation of Contraries cannot be
also been be denied.

को हि = एक प्रमातृ अभावे

* न च तथाभूतम् अपि व्यवधानम् अत्र प्रतीतौ संवेद्यते

एवं परपक्षेऽनुपपत्तिं .... to end:

Thus after showing the relation of Contraries
according to the opponent's theory, he now
concludes the discussion on the point in

hand by asserting that the relation of Contraries arises, According to this System, from the fact that all Cognitions rest in one Subject. It is Consistent with reason if it be admitted to spring from the Subject. We have already explained that it is he (the permanent Subject) who organises the Cognitions in that matter. This being the real explanation (of the relations of Contraries) if Some one talks of the impossibility of practical life without it (अन्यथानुपपत्ति:) as the the means of proving it, let him do so. Now every aspect of it can be accounted for.

न केवलमेते .... उपसंहारक्रमेण दर्शयति

Not only relations of cause and effect, of remembrance and of contraries, which characterises all the general transactions of ordinary every-day life, but the particular transactions also as such as purchase and sale, which are impure and relations of teacher and taught etc, which are pure, depend upon one subject, because transactions depend upon some kind of unification. This is what he shows in the concluding lines:-

समन्वय व्यवहार प्राणः = depend upon some kind of unification.

इत्थमत्यर्थभिन्नार्थावभासखचिते विभौ ।
समलो विमलो वापि व्यवहारोऽनुभूयते ॥४४॥

योजना: इत्थम् (अनुभव एव अत्र दृढतमं प्रमाणं यत्) अत्यर्थ-भिन्न-अर्थ-अवभास खचिते (अत्यर्थं भिन्नैः प्रतिबिम्बकल्पैः अर्थाभासैः खचिते - स्वरूपानन्याभावेन उपरक्ते) विभौ (प्रमातरि विश्रान्तिः) समलो (अज्ञानिनां मलिनः), विमलो (ज्ञानिनां शुद्धः) (सर्वो व्यवहारो अनुभूयते)

Eng: "Thus experience shows that all transactions whether pure or impure, depend upon the omnipresent Lord, in whom all the objective manifestations, so very different from one another, are reflected".

'तत्तद्भिन्नेति' .... इदमपि मन्तव्यम् =
on account of the both positive and negative arguments, given in two verses "तत्तद्भिन्नेति" ("those various etc"), as well as of types of illustrations of practical life ~~is expressed~~ given in other verses, this also has to be admitted —

उदाहरण

— यत् विभौ .... सर्वो व्यवहारोऽनुभूयते
— the practical life is experienced as resting on the omnipresent Lord, who is beyond temporal + spatial limitation and who is affected, without undergoing a change in his essential nature, by objects, such as blue and pleasure etc, which are extremely different from ~~and~~ one another, ie whose very life is diversity, because they are the creations of Maya and which are very much like shadows and therefore have no existence independently of Him (on whom they are reflected).

अनुभव एव ---- इति यावत् = This means that the direct experience is the strongest proof on this point.

अनुभूयते च सोपदेशौ अवधानधनै — येन एषा सैव प्रमातृतत्त्व प्रख्यात्मिका शिवभूमिः॥ सैव संसारसमता व्यवहारदशा = And as such is the experience of those also, who have

उपपादयितव्यम् = साधनीयम्, तच्च = माहेश्वर्यं च

उभय प्रकारम् = द्विप्रकारं भवति, ज्ञानविषयः यस्य क्रियाविषयः
यस्य तादृशम्.

यतः = प्रकारद्वयाहेतोः भगवान् ज्ञाता कर्ता च भवति,

व्युत्पादनाय = अज्ञबोधनार्थाय,

तत्परिघटित एव = शास्त्रकारभावमासाद्य तेन निर्मित एव भवति

yet this difference has been brought about by Himself in order to make others understand (true nature of Shiva).

विभागः = ज्ञान क्रिया रूप इत्यर्थः

तेन = यतोऽयं विभागः परव्युत्पादनमात्र प्रयोजन एव भवति
ततः कारणात्

ज्ञानात्मक क्रियाविषयं = स्वातन्त्र्यं यद्यपि क्रियाशक्तिरूप } Therefore although freedom in the act of knowing is identical with power of Action, yet "freedom" should be discussed in the book dealing with Knowledge, as it pertains to that.

तद्विषयत्वात् = ज्ञानविषयत्वात्.

एवं च .... भवति = Thus the meaning of the word "Knower" (ज्ञातृ) is fully settled as regards both its root + affix.

एवं च = ज्ञानक्रिययोरेकत्वे सति,

ज्ञातृशब्दार्थः = तृच् प्रत्ययान्त ज्ञाधात्वार्थः, प्रकृतितः = वाचिन्या प्रकृतेः स्वबोधरूपः

प्रत्ययतश्च = स्वान्तः कृतक्रियाकर्तृ वाचि तृच् प्रत्ययाद्च,

संपूर्णतया = सम्यक् पूर्णतया, निर्णीता भवति = ज्ञान क्रियात्मकैकपिण्डवाचकत्वेन स्थापनादिति भावः

तत्र ज्ञाने नाम ...."अहमिति" संवेदनम् = Knowledge is nothing else than the "I-Conscious, limited by the affection of, cast by variety of manifestations, brought about by Him Self.

अहमिति संवेदनम् = परिमिताहंतारूपम्

स्वयं भेदिताः = अपोहनाद्याकृत्या स्वतो भिन्नतया भासिताः ये आभासभेदाः = घटपटादिरूपाः

ते उपाश्रयाः यस्याः तादृशी या नियतरूपाश्रयणम्, तया सङ्कुचितम् तन्मात्रज्ञातृत्वेन स्थितमिति

तत्र आभासेषु स्वातन्त्र्यम् = तावन्मात्रेण तु सर्वत्र स्वातन्त्र्य-रूपम्

अयं सङ्क्षेपः = यतः परिमिताहंतारूपम घटपटादिषु ज्ञातृतया स्थितं ज्ञानशब्दवाच्यं वस्तु एव देहाद्युपाधे निष्कृष्टमत एव पराकाष्ठामाश्रितं पराहंतारूपं सर्वज्ञत्वरूपं महास्वातन्त्र्यं भवति ॥

"तात्कालिकाक्षसामक्ष्यं ..... = Begining with "Immediate sense contact"

आभासान्तरापेक्षी = dependent on another manifestation. (when Abhāsa is अस्फुट.

आभासोऽन्यथा वा = or otherwise ie independent when Abhasa is स्फुटतर—

स एव आभास एक इति = that manifestation (Abhāsa) is unity only.

१अर्थक्रियाभासोऽपि .... पुनः श्लोकद्वयेन : Accordingly the 'manifestation' of "Causal efficiency" is also dependent on another "manifestation", he states, in 2 verses, the manifestation, in which Causal efficiency resides.

आभासान्तरविचित्रस्य .... आन्तरत्वम् : Internality is the basis of variety in Abhāsa, which is due to affection of one manifestation by others.

आभासान्तरैः चित्रितः = विचित्रीकृतः आभासः आभासान्तर चित्रिताभासः, तस्य भित्तिस्थानीयम् = आधारभूतम्

आन्तरत्वम् = प्रकाशान्तर्गतत्वम्

ततो बाह्यत्वे .... श्लोकयुग्मेन : Then in 2 verses he states the essential nature of externality and its subdivisions.

ननु यदि ---------- उपपद्यामः = But if the whole practical life depends upon the Highest Lord, the well known variety, characterised by distinctness and indistinctness, would not be possible, because that lustrous Lord, on whom all this depends, is one. And we cannot suppose that the practical life has got any reality apart from Him. So the Author says:-

तत् = तदा, अस्य = व्यवहारस्य, येन = भिन्नभूतेन येन प्रमात्रा, अनुप्राणितः = दत्तसत्ताकः

अयम् = व्यवहारः

तात्कालिकाक्षसामक्ष्यसापेक्षाः केवलं क्वचित् ।
आभासा अन्यथान्यत्र त्वन्धान्धतमसादिषु ॥१॥

विशेषोऽर्थावभासस्य सत्तायां न पुनः क्वचित्
विकल्पेषु भवेद्भाविभवद्भूतार्थगामिषु ॥२॥ (क्वचित्)

योजना :

(१) आभासाः क्वचित् (कदाचित्) केवलं तात्कालिकं (तत्काल-भवं यत् सन्निहितं, निकटवर्ति) अक्षसामक्ष्यं (बाह्येन्द्रिय-प्रत्यक्षत्वं यत्) तत्सापेक्षाः (तान् आभासान्तरान् अपेक्षन्ते), अन्यत्र (क्वचित्) तु अन्ध- (अथवा) अन्धतमसादिषु) (ते आभासाः) अन्यथा (भवन्ति)॥

(२) भावि-भवद्-भूत- अर्थगामिषु विकल्पेषु (भविष्यविषया वा वर्तमानविषया वा अतीत वस्तु विश्रान्ता वा विकल्पाः तेषु) अर्थ-अवभासस्य सत्तायां न पुनः क्वचित विशेषो भवेत (भवति) (यस्मात्- स्वात्मनि आभासानाम् ऐक्यं भवति) ॥

Eng: "The manifestation differ only in as much as that in some cases they depend upon immediate sense-contact; and in others, as in case of thick-darkness, they do not do so. But there is no difference in the essential nature of the objective 'manifestation' (Abhasa) (figuring) in determinate cognitions, referring to the past, present or future objects."

एतावता = सापेक्षत्वनिरपेक्षत्वादिना

केवलं .... संवादः = Manifestations differ from one another in this much only (they are dependent on the direct perception in one case & are not so in the other), but there is no difference in the essential nature of the objective manifestation anywhere. This is the substance of both the above verses, if we take them together.

यस्मिन् काले स्वस्वाभास आभाति तत्काले एव भाति = An Abhāsa exists only so long as it shines.

आभासान्तर: अक्षादिसंवेदनम्: अन्यः आभासः यद् भवति, कीदृशम्? "पश्यामि" इति संवेदनं यस्य तादृशम्। तत्सापेक्षा = आभासान्तरापेक्षा युक्ता ॥

यत् आभासान्तरसंसर्गं —........ यत्र स्फुटताव्यवहारः = In some cases the manifestations are related to, mixed up with, another manifestation, the sense-contact, the external-sense-perception in the form of "I see", which takes place just at the time when that manifestation shines. In such cases they are said to be clear.

यत्र = यस्मिन् प्रत्यक्षस्थले इत्यर्थः। तत्र = विकल्पमात्ररूपे तस्मिन् व्यवहारे। अन्यथा = आभासान्तरापेक्षा-रहिता। तात्कालिकम् = दृष्टिकालीनम्। अनुसंधत्ते = स्मरति

अन्धविषयः — .... अनुसंधत्ते = But in the transaction of a cogniser in the dark, which is indistinct, the manifestations are otherwise (i.e. were not mixed with the then direct perception). That is to say, to the person who is born blind the other manifestations namely the external-sense-perception does not exist at all and to the person who has become blind by accident and, therefore, has fallen in the thickest darkness, it has no existence at that time (time of blindness) but he remembers his former direct perceptions.

तस्मात् .... प्रतीतवस्तुविश्रान्तता वा =

There is, therefore, no difference possible in the being, the real nature, of the objective manifestations in any form of determinate cognition, may those cognitions be related to present, future or past objects.

एतदुक्तं भवति .... to end. The crux of the whole thing is that in all cognitions "I see", "determinately apprehend", "imagine", "remember", "do" or "speak of this blue", the manifestation "blue" in its real nature is the same; & so is the manifestation "I see" which is related to "yellow" etc also. This idea of clearness or otherwise arises only when Lord unites the "manifestations" with or separates them from one another, because of his freedom: i.e. when the manifestation "blue" is separated from the manifestation "I imagine" and is joined with the manifestation "I see" it is spoken of as distinct. Thus distinctions in practical life at all times can be accounted for. But when these manifestations are in the Lord Himself, then there is no union with or separation from any other.

न्यूनाधिकः = न्यूनातिरिक्तः, एकरूप इति यावत,
एवम् = नीलवत्, पीतादिषु यः पश्यामीत्यादि = पश्यामीत्येवं रूप आभासो भवति सोऽपि स्वरूपतो न्यूनाधिको भवति इति पूर्वेण संबन्धः।
तदाश्रयम् — प्रसिद्धः स्फुटत्वास्फुटत्वादि व्यवहारः भवति,
व्यवच्छेदनेन = वियोजनेन,

ननु एतत नीलादिषु ------- = This explaination ma be all right in the case of blue etc, i.e. relation to which external objects senses operate. But how can the manifestations "pleasure" etc shine differently because in relation to them there is no operation of external sense (to explain it).

सुखादिषु च सौख्यादिहेतुष्वपि च वस्तुषु।
अवभासस्य सद्भावेऽप्यतीतत्वात्तथा स्थितिः ॥३॥

गाढमुल्लिख्यमाने तु विकल्पे न सुखादिके।
तथा स्थितिस्तथैव स्यात्स्फुटमस्योपलक्षणा ॥४॥

योजना :- (यद्यपि) सुखादिषु च सौख्य हेतुषु वस्तुषु अपि (अवभासस्य सत्तायां न विशेषः भवति), (तथापि) अतीतत्वात (अतीत वस्तु विश्रांतत्वात्) अवभासस्य (सुखादि अवभासस्य) सद्भावे (सत्तायां), तथा स्थितिः (न भवति इत्यर्थः) ॥

Eng : Although manifestations such as pleasure etc. ~~in relation to~~ or those which are the means ~~of that~~ thereof, remain always the same; yet they shine differently because they are unified with another manifestation, namely the "past".

"But when the "manifestations" (ślokas) pleasure etc are repeatedly & determinately pictured they shine as before, ~~before~~ because they are unified with the manifestation "clear" or "present".

सुखे.............. सामग्रीको वा इति = Although manifestation "Abhāsa" (of pleasure etc) is the same in the case of past or future enjoyment, or its cause such as garland & sandal etc; and the same holds good of suffering and its causes, such as serpent or thorn etc, yet because of its mixing up with the "manifestation" "it is past" or 'it is to come' and separation from the "manifestation", "I am experiencing", the experiencer does not have the same experience as he had before, namely "I am happy at present' or "I am ~~by~~ unhappy' or "I have acquired the thing necessary for happiness" etc (~~there~~ though these manifestations are still there).

यदा तु .... इति संभाव्यम् to end.

But when he constantly and determinately pictures up the objects of pleasure or pain, then because of association with the cause, namely, the repeated & determinate picturing up of pleasure & its causes, he has the experience, "I am happy" in no other way than the one, pointed out by us, namely, union with ~~other~~ another manifestation. ~~This~~ This is right, because at that time thinker has consciousness of "pleasure - manifestation (सुखाभास).
Here the word "past" implies "future" also

तत्कारणे = सुखकारणे
स एव = एक एवेत्यर्थः
आभासान्तरेण = व्यतिरिक्तेनाभासेन सह
यतः = यस्माद्धेतोः
व्याप्तिग्रहण = योजनेति यावत्
अनुभवामीत्याभासात् = वर्तमानतावभासात्
विच्छेदः = वियोजना,
तेन = व्याप्तिग्रहणाविच्छेदाभ्यां हेतुः
विद्यमानेष्वपि → विद्यमानत्वे चात्र स्मरण-
कृतमेव ज्ञेयम्, ~~अतीत~~ अनागते तु
मनोराज्यकृतम्, तेषु = सुखादिषु
तत् हेतुषु च,

योजना:--
सुखादिषु सौख्यादिहेतुषु च वस्तुषु - स्मर्यमाण
तथा मनोराज्यविषयत्वेन च वर्तमानेष्वपि,
I part तथा अवभासस्य - सुखावभासस्य तत् हेत्वव-
भासस्य च सद्भावेऽपि - स्मृतिरूप मनोराज्य-
रूपत्वाभ्यां सद्भावेऽपि, प्रमातुः अर्थात्
तेषु, तथास्थितिः - तथा स्थितिर्न भवति,
कुतः? अतीतत्वात, न हि अतीतं स्मर्यमाणं
~~सुखादि~~ सुखादि तत् हेतुर्वा तादृगवभासते
तथा उपलक्षणत्वमाश्रित्य अनागतत्वात्,
न हि मनोराज्यलिखितं भावि सुखं तत् हेतुर्वा
तादृगावभासते इति॥

II part विकल्पेन - स्मृतिरूपेण मनोराज्यरूपेण च
P.T.O विकल्पसन्तानेन, अतीते अनागते वा सुख

सुखादिके, गाढम् — अविच्छिन्नप्रवाहेण,
उल्ले उल्लिख्यमाने सति, तथा —
अस्मदुक्तप्रकारेण, आभासान्तराव्यामिश्र-
-णारूपेणेति यावत्,
तथास्थिति → भूत-भाव्य अनुभवकाल-
वत् स्फुटतया अवस्थानम्,
स्यात् = भवेत्
कुतः? अस्य = सुखाद्यवभासस्य
स्फुटमनुपलक्षणात् ॥

ननु इयता किमुक्तम् भवति — .... सत्ताया एव अभावात्

But what does all, that has been said to explain the variety of experiences, mean? Does it not mean that external garland etc are the causes of pleasure and pain and that pleasure etc, caused by external objects are the causes of experience "I am happy etc. It follows from this that in the presence absence of externality (garland pleasure etc, not being caused by the former, etc) will not be the causes of experiences "I am happy" Therefore, if there be no externality (of garlands etc) they cannot at all be represented to exist. How can then the statement "there is never any difference in the real nature of manifestations of the object, ("अर्थावभासस्य सत्तायां न कापि विशेषः") इति be justified? For, (in the latter case) they have no existence. The teacher replies:—

भावाभावावभासानां बाह्यतोपाधिरिष्यते ।
नात्मा सत्ता ततस्तेषामान्तराणां सतां सदा ॥ ५ ॥

योजना:-

भाव (सुखमस्ति मम इति) - अभाव (दुखं नास्ति मम इति) अवभासानां बाह्यतका (त्वे) उपाधिर् इष्यते (ज्ञायते अस्माभिः) न (तेषाम्) आत्मा (स्वरूपम्) ततस् तेषाम् आन्तराणां सतां सत्ता सदा (भवति) ॥

खण्डान्वय योजना = पण्डितैः भावाभावावभासानां बाह्यता उपाधिः - विशेषको धर्म उच्यते, उत्पलस्येव नीलत्वम्, यौ ते पण्डितैः बाह्यतया आत्मा स्वरूपं नेष्यते। ततः कारणात् तेषाम् भावाभावावभासानां आन्तरत्वेन सत्ता सदा सत्ता भवति। ततश्च बाह्यत्वाभावे न तेषां सत्ताया अभावः। ततश्च तस्यां सत्तायां तेषां ~~विशेष~~ विशेष एवेति भाव इति॥

Eg: "Externality of manifestations (Abhāsas) which are of the nature of "being" (Bhāvā) or those which are of the nature of "not being" (Abhāvā) is merely an attribute & does not constitute their essential nature, therefore, they ever exist as internal."

इह सुखमस्ति मम, ... इति आन्तराणां सदैव स्थितिः एषाम् ॥

Externality is not the essential nature of either the positive or the negative manifestations; eg. "Here I have pleasure" or "I have no pain"; because the real nature of pleasure does not shine as "externality," but only as "pleasure". Externality is another manifestation. When the Lord by virtue of His power of freedom, makes it manifest as united with "pleasure", their externality becomes its attribute. Therefore just as absence of manifestation of "blue" does not affect the real nature of manifestation "Lotus" or the absence of manifestation of "king" does not that of "man", so even when manifestation "externality" is absent, manifestation "pleasure," "pain", or "wife" is not affected in any way, because they always exist internally.

इहअन्तः .... -अन्तःकरणमध्येभवत्वात् →

The manifestations, such as blue etc, when reflected on the internal organ, the mirror of Buddhi, are internal, in as much as they are within internal organ.

बाह्यत्वमपि .... बाह्यप्रत्यक्षता, and they are external; because they shine as separate from subject as objects of knowledge. And pure externality is simply external perceptibility.

अत्र च अवस्थाद्वयेऽपि .... विदधीरन्? In both both the conditions (internal as well as external.

there manifestations (Abhāsas) 'blue' etc exercise their functional power inasmuch as they are give rise to knowledge, referring to themselves. But why do they not exercise their functional capacity in the state of externality, the chief characteristic of which is oneness with the subject? With this objection in mind, the Author says:—

भवत्वात् = स्फुरत्वात्॥ अमी = नीलाभासादयः

अन्ततः = परमार्थतः, स्वविषयं ज्ञानमर्थक्रियाम् = स्वविषयज्ञानरूपामर्थक्रि

कथं न विदधीरन् = कथं न कुर्वन्तीति सम्भाव्यते

आन्तरत्वात्प्रमात्रैक्ये नैषां भेदनिबन्धना।
अर्थक्रियापि बाह्यत्वे सा भिन्नाभासभेदतः
॥६॥

योजना :-
एषां (आभासानाम्) भेदनिबन्धना (कार्यकारणादि-भेदाश्रया) अर्थक्रिया अपि आन्तरत्वात न (नास्ति), T (तेषाम् आन्तरत्व) प्रमातृ-ऐक्ये (प्रमातृमात्ररूपत्वात्) (भवति); सा (अर्थक्रिया) (तेषां) बाह्यत्वे भिन्न-आभास-भेदतः (आभास-भेदात्) (भवति)"

Eng: "They do not exercise their functional capacity in the state of internality, which is due to their oneness with the subject. For, the condition of that (exercise of functional power) is the externality, which arises from separateness of manifestations from one another & from the subject."

प्रमात्रैक्य इति .... Band.

Because of their internality, due to oneness with the subject, these manifestations do not exercise their functional capacity: because it depends upon their separateness. And because the manifestation 'blue' is separate from the

manifestation 'yellow' and because it is also separate from the Subject, therefore, it can exercise its functional capacity in relation to the Subject. In the state of oneness with the Subject, there is no separateness. And exercise of fixed functional capacity depends upon separateness of manifestation. Thus even when there is the manifestation (Abhāsā) of externality of the darling, but if there be no manifestation (Abhāsā) of embrace at the same time, the purpose of being a source of pleasure is not fulfilled. And if there be other manifestations (Abhāsās) such as "She is far away", then it will, as we know, discharge a function contrary to the previous one i.e rather than being the cause of pleasure it will be that of pain.

Hence because there is no functional capacity Abhāsa of externality at the time of identity with the Subject, therefore there is no functional capacity exercised by the ~~Subject~~ object. The exercise of functional capacity also is a kind of Abhāsā. And exercising certain functional capacity is not the essential nature of object so that in the absence thereof it may not have its existence also.

तन्निमित्तिकम् = प्रमात्रैक्यनिमित्तकम् ।

भेदनिबन्धना = भेदे निमित्तभूते सतीत्यर्थः

भिद्यते = भगवदपोहनशक्त्या स्वयं भेदविषयतां भजेत -

स्वेन साध्यां नियताम् = स्वमात्रे लग्नाम् ।

अर्थक्रियाम् = स्वविषयज्ञानादिरूपाम् । — 'कुर्यात्' इति —

— तथैव भगवन्मायाशक्त्या उत्थानादिति भावः

तदा = प्रमात्रन्तरत्वावस्थायाम्

आलिङ्गनलक्षणस्य → तस्य सह आलिङ्गनस्वरूपस्य ,

व्यपगमे - दूरीभवेन , दूरीभवति ।

"इयम् इति" → च आभासान्तरस्य - इयं कान्ता दूरे गतेत्येव-
रूपस्यान्यस्याभासस्य , उपगमे = प्राप्तौ सत्याम् ,

अन्या = प्रह्लादाभावरूपा प्रत्युत सन्तापरूपा ।

आभासान्तरमेव = भावाऽभावाभासादन्य एवाभासः ।

तदभावे = अर्थक्रियाया अभावे

स्वरूपोऽभावः = भावाभावाभासयोः स्वरूपाभावः ॥

∴ बाह्याभासेन यद् व्यतिभेदनम् — विच्छित्तीकरणम् , तस्य काले = समये
यदा "बाह्यमिदम्" इति वस्तु गृह्यते तदेति यावत् ।
आन्तराभासः = "आन्तरमिदम्" इत्याभासः ।

ननु च बाह्याभास ...."आन्तराणां य आभासः स सदा" इति

See left Page 580

०व्यतिभेदनकाले = संभेदनकाले,

विरोधात् = एकस्यैवान्तरत्व बाह्यत्व लक्षणायोगात्

आन्तराणाम् = प्रमात्रन्तः स्थितानां वस्तूनाम् ॥

But internality of Abhāsās must get broke at the time of their unification with the manifestation "external"; because it is contradictory. And if so, how can it be said "internal always shine". To this he replies as follows :-

चिन्मयत्वेऽवभासानामन्तरेव स्थितिः सदा ।
मायया भासमानानां बाह्यत्वात् बहिरप्यसौ ॥६॥

योजना :- आभासानां चिन्मयत्वे (तेषां) स्थितिः सदैव अन्तर् (भवति); मायया भासमानानाम् (मायाशक्त्या बहिः प्रत्यक्षत्वेन प्रकाशमानानाम् अवभासानां) बाह्यत्वात् (तेषाम्) असौ (स्थितिः) बहिर अपि (अस्ति)".

Eng: "As the Abhāsās are essentially of the nature of consciousness, so they always exist internally. But when they are manifested externally by the Māyā, they exist externally also.

इह .... इति उक्तं यतः =

Abhāsās always have their existence in the light of Consciousness of the universal Subject, whether they be in the state of internality or externality because they are essentially of the nature of Consciousness. Otherwise they would not shine. This has already been established.

यदा तु माया शक्त्या .... end =

But when the power of Māyā, which is nothing but the power of freedom, operating in manifesting things separately, makes them externally manifest, then, because of the externality (brought about by Māyā) they have both internal & external manifestation. This shining within is not of the opposite nature from shining without (so that when one is there the other cannot be); but it is the background of all manifestations. How then can there be represented to be any contradiction? It has therefore been said "Internals always exist".

भि = छेदेन = परस्परमान्योन्यतश्च भेदेन, अवभासन्ते = नीलाद्यवभासाः

स्वातन्त्र्यम् = स्वतन्त्रता, तद्रूपं यस्यास्तादृश्या –

एषां = नीलाद्याभासानाम्, तत् = बाह्यत्वम्

असौ = अन्तराभासः।

"तत्कथं विरोधः" – नहि घटाभासो पटाभासविरोधीति भावः

आन्तराणाम् = आन्तरत्वेन स्थितानां नीलादीनाम्।

एवमत्रोत्तरार्धे योजना:–

मायया भासमानानाम् = भेदेन भासमानानाम्।

अर्थात् एषामान्तराणां नीलाद्याभासानाम्, मायया बाह्यत्वात् – मायाकृतं बाह्यत्वमाश्रित्य, असौ स्थितिः नाद्वैयपि भवति ॥

ननु बाह्यत्वे सति .... पिशाचादिः त्रासादि-
विधायी?

But it has been said that exercise of functional capacity on the part of an object is possible only when it is external and that externality is perceptibility by means of external senses. But this kind of externality is not possible in the case of what is pictured up by immagination. How can then they exercise any functional capacity? But it is found that pishācha etc pictured up in immagination, cause fear. With this objection in mind the author says as follows:-

विकल्पे योऽयमुल्लेखः सोऽपि बाह्यः पृथक्प्रथः
प्रमात्रैकात्म्यमान्तर्यं ततो भेदो हि बाह्यता ॥८॥

योजना:- विकल्पे (विकल्पज्ञाने) यो पृथक्-प्रथः (प्रमातृ-सकाशात् पृथगेव प्रथते यो सः) अयम् उल्लेखः (उत्प्रेक्षया लिख्यमानः) सोऽपि बाह्यः (भवति); आन्तर्यम् प्रमातृ-एकात्म्यम्; बाह्यता, हि ततो भेदः॥

Eng: "This, that is pictured up in the immagination, is also external, because it shines as separate (from the subject as "this" and not as "I"). Internality

consists in oneness with the Subject. Separateness from that is externality."

विमर्शस्य = सामान्यता स्थितस्य विमर्शस्य, विशेषरूपे

उल्लिख्यमानः = उल्लेखविषयतां नीयमानः

सोऽपि = कान्ताचोरादिरपि, प्रथते = प्रकाशते

अयं इति = इदन्तया।

The wife or thief etc pictured up in imagination, is also external. For, not only that (is external) which is externally perceive but that also which shines as separate from the Subject as 'this'.

यत् च प्रमातरि ...... तत् आन्तरत्वम् = And internality is the shining in the Subject "I".

अन्तरिति निकटम्, तत् च किंचित् अपेक्ष्य = "Anta means near. And nearness requires some thing, in relation to which it may be asserted.

अपेक्षणीयस्य .... to end:-

And in the absence of other requisite (of internality), the Subject alone is the unexceptionable requisite in all cas Therefore it follows that nearness to the Subject is oneness with it. That which

is different from it (the subject) is external.
Therefore it is but proper that what is pictured up in imagination should also exercise functional capacity.

विमर्शस्य = सामान्यतया स्थितस्य विमर्शस्य, विशेषरूपे।
सोऽपि = कान्ताचौरादिरपि,
प्रथते = प्रकाशते , अयकं इति – इदन्तयेत्यर्थः
निकटम् = समीपम् , तत् च = निकटञ्च, अपेक्ष्य-भवति इति :
अपेक्षणीयान्तराभावे = प्रमातुर्व्यतिरिक्तस्य पेक्षणीयस्याभावे सतीत्यर्थः ॥
तस्मात् हेतुर तादात्म्यम् प्राप्तम्
इति = अस्मात् कारणात् , ततः = तस्मात् प्रमातुः
इति = अतो हेतोः

next page. } = तत्त्वभासितः → ईश्वरेणैवादो हुन श तथाऽवभासितः
यः कोऽयस्पन्द कुम्भकारशरीरचेष्टा,
सः पर्वेन यस्यास्ताहशी। अन्तः स्फुरितेऽपि
हि बाह्यस्पन्दभावेन स्फुरति

ननु कुम्भकारादि......... इत्याशङ्क्याह ॥

अन्तरस्य = मेत्ताऽस्य: तस्करो यो: भयं = तिरस्या: ।

The pūrvāpakṣin questions again, as has been said above, the causal efficiency of external objects is due to their externality, for instance, in the case of potters manufacturing pots, but how can we explain the causal efficiency of internal experiences, like the conceptions (vikalpajñānāni) of external objects, such as one's beloved or a thief, which cause pleasure or fear, although the objects giving rise to such feelings are not actually present externally?

अन्तःकरणगोचरस्य = नीलादेः सुखादेश्च ·
किं कृते = केन कृतं भवद्भिर्बाह्यत्वम् ॥

उल्लेखस्य सुखादेश्च प्रकाशो बहिरात्मना ।
इच्छातो भर्तुरध्यक्षरूपोऽक्षादिभुवां यथा ॥९॥

योजना :—

अक्षादिभुवां (विजयाराणाम्) (प्रकाशः) अध्यक्षरूपः (मायीय प्रमातुः विच्छिन्नरूपेण बाह्यत्वेन भासते) यथा, उल्लेखस्य (सांकल्पिक नामपि) सुखादेश्च बहिरात्मना प्रकाशः, (स) भर्तुर् (परमेश्वरस्य) इच्छातः (इच्छावशात्) भवति ॥

Eng: The teacher now explains the cause of externality, of internal feelings of pleasure or fear, which are caused by the mere conceptions (thought) of objects like one's beloved or thief. He says, it is the will of the Lord, the perceiver, (भर्तुर् इच्छया) that what is conceived in imagination (उल्लेखः) as well as pleasure etc, shines externally (बहिरात्मना प्रकाशते), exactly as do the objects of sense perception etc (प्रत्यक्षादि भवां विषयानाम् प्रकाशः यथा), which are directly perceptible (प्रत्यक्षरूपा)

प्रजाह्रिभूता अपि = बहिर्देशमागता अपि

बाह्यकरणगोचरीभूताः सन्तः कल्पिताः प्रमातुः - देहादेः प्रमातुः

विच्छिन्नरूपत्वेन बाह्यत्वेन — इदन्ताग्राह्यत्वेन बहिर्देशस्थत्वेन

भासन्ते, तथा = तद्वत्,

अन्तःकरणगोचरीभूता अपि नीलाद्याः विच्छिन्नरूपत्वेन

बाह्यत्वेन भासन्ते, परप्रमात्रपेक्षया अन्तःकरणस्यापि

बाह्यत्वात्, अन्यथा "इदम्" इति ग्रहणायोगादिति भावः,

भरताद्युक्तरूपाः: भरतशास्त्रादि - उक्तरूपाः

न तु सर्वथा सुखदुःख स्वरूपमात्ररूपाः - हासादिरूपत्वस्यापि स्थितत्वात्

स्थायिव्यभिचारिरूपः = स्थाय्यष्टकत्रयस्त्रिंशत्संख्याकव्यभिचारिरूपाश्च,

रतिनिर्वेदादयः = लक्षणया रतिनिर्वेदादिसंयोगप्रादुर्भूतं रसाष्टकं,

अतः

बहिरात्मना → परमात्तु विच्छिन्नीभूतत्वात् नीलादीनां द्विविधकरणग्राह्यत्वेन
भान्ति → बाह्यत्वम्, सुखादीनान्तु अन्तःकरणग्राह्यत्वमात्रेणेति भावः।

लौकिकसुखादीनां तु तादृक्पृथग्भावात् भरतशास्त्रप्रसिद्धरसग्रहणम्।

यद्यपि तत्र दुःखस्यापि सुखरूपतैव तथापि दुःखतया स्फुरणमप्य →

→ निवार्यमेव पानके इव मरिचतिक्ततायाः। पानके भातादि हि मरिचति-
~~तिक्तताधेव~~ क्तताऽऽस्वादमाधिकं करोति। तथा विभावादिसंयोगे
जातमपि दुःखमास्वादमेव जनयति। अन्यथा रसत्वायोगात्, रसो हि
मिलितविभावादिस्वादमात्रमेव।

क्षेत्रज्ञस्यैव = देहाभिमानिनो जीवस्यैव,

व्यग्भावयितुम् = बाधयितुम्.

तत् = स्वातन्त्र्यम्

अर्थस्थितिः — अर्थविषयो ज्ञानादिव्यवहारः,

निरूढा = नियता — नहि प्रमाणपूर्वकरहितात् घटादेरर्थ-
स्थितिर्दृश्यते.

सा = अर्थस्थितिः — तादात्म्येन = परमात्मरूपेण

तस्य = परमात्मनः

यन्त्रणा = परिच्छेदः

— स्वरसवाही स्वेच्छया प्रसरणशीलः यः व्याक्षेपः स सारो
यस्यास्तादृशी — कदाचिद् जीवः स्वेच्छाविनैव
सङ्कल्पविशी भवति

For Kārikā 10-11

देशकालाकारैः च : संकोचः = परिच्छेदः
तेन वैकल्यात् - रहितत्वात्, नहि परिच्छेदकं प्रति परिच्छेद्य-
स्य परिच्छेदकत्वं युक्तम् इति भावः
एकत्वम् = प्रकाशैकत्वम्.
स एव च : प्रकाश एव च.

॥

अस्य प्रकाशस्य, स्वात्मा = प्रकाशाख्यो निजात्मा
परामर्शनशून्यः → स्वकर्तृक परामर्शाविषयः
— यथा स्फटिकमणेरात्मा नीलाद्युपरागश्च अहमिति
इदमिति च परामर्शस्याविषयः तथास्य नास्तीत्यर्थः
पुनरस्यात्मा नीलाद्युपरागश्च कीदृशोऽस्तीत्यत आह,
"अपितु" इति. — अपितु अस्य प्रकाशस्य स्वात्मा
नीलाद्युपरागश्च "विमृश्यमानरूपः" "अहम्" इति
"अयम्" इति च विमर्शविषयरूपयुक्तो भवतीत्यर्थः)
तदेवास्य माहेश्वर्यं भवति — तेनैवासौ महेश्वरो भवतीत्यर्थः
अहंभावात्मा → इदम्-भावस्यापि परमार्थतोऽहंभाव
एव विश्रान्तेः ।
तत्रैव — ज्ञान एव,
स्वातन्त्र्यात्मा — कर्तृत्वरूपः
विमर्शः — तदन्तर्तृच् प्रत्ययवाच्यो विमर्शः — क्रिया भवति,
कर्तृः क्रियामयत्वात् तृच् च कर्तरि
विहितत्वादिति भावः ।
अन्तःकृत प्रकाशः — सारभूत प्रकाश इत्यर्थः ।
विमर्श एव = अहंपरामर्श एव, परावस्थायाम्: शिवभुवि
वर्तमाने - स्थितो, ज्ञानक्रिये इति पूर्वेण संबन्धः
इति = एवम्, स एव च = विमर्श एव च - क्रिया भवति
किं इति = अतः, स एव भावैः — एतदनन्तर स्थितस्य
उपक्षेपम् = बीजत्वेन ज्ञापनम्

ॐ

अदृष्टमण्डलोऽप्येवं - यः कश्चिद्वेत्ति तत्त्वतः
स सिद्धिभाग्भवेन्नित्यं - स योगी स च दीक्षितः

आद्यन्तरहितं बीजं - विकसत्तिथिमध्यगम्
हृत्पद्मान्तर्गतं ध्यायेत - सोमांशं नित्यमभ्यसेत्

मन्त्रकोटयो ह्यसंख्याताः सर्वाः सर्वाधिकारिकाः
शिव शक्ति प्रभावाश्च - सर्वे शक्ति समन्विताः
भोग मोक्षप्रदाः सर्वाः स्वशक्तिबल बृंहिताः

किन्तु देवः परः शान्तो - ह्यप्रमेय गुणान्वितः
शिवः सर्वात्मकः शुद्धो - भावग्राह्यो ह्यनुत्तमः
आश्रयः परमस्तेषां - व्यापकः परमेश्वरः

End.